HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL RELIGION

JUNE 1954 PRICE 1s. 6d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—Man in Society—The Biblical Doctrine—The Kingdom of God—The Dilemma of the Preacher—Preaching on the Last Things 257

II. IMPORTANT AND INFLUENTIAL FOREIGN BOOKS: GOGUEL'S 'LIFE OF JESUS.' By the Reverend C. Leslie Mitton, B.A., M.Th., Ph.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham 259

III. LITERATURE 263

IV. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: RELIGIOUS BROADCASTING TO SCHOOLS. By the Reverend Robert C. Walton, The British Broadcasting Corporation 271

V. IS Q AN ARAMAIC DOCUMENT? By the Reverend Frederick Bussby, M.B.E., B.D., M.Litt., Holy Trinity Vicarage, Bournemouth 272

VI. THE CHRISTIAN HOPE AND THE PROBLEM OF DEMYTHOLOGIZING (*continued*). By Professor Rudolf Bultmann, D.D., Zürich 276

VII. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 278
2. The Christian Year 279

VIII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
1. Scriptural Quotations in Q Material. By the Reverend A. W. Argyle, M.A., B.D., Regent's Park College, Oxford 285
2. A Note on John xviii. 6. By Peter Mein, Nov. S.S.M., Nottingham. . . . 286
3. θησαυρῷ κεκρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ (Mt. xiii. 44); σκάψω περὶ (συνῆν) (Lk xiii. 8). By the Reverend Eric F. F. Bishop, The University, Glasgow 287
4. The Miracle at Cana. By the Reverend P. A. Illingworth, Natland, Kendal . . 287

IX. ENTRE NOUS—True Preaching—Billy Graham. 287

VOLUME LXV. No. 9

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH

EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

ORIGEN'S TREATISE ON PRAYER

E. G. JAY — 27s. 6d. net

A translation, with notes and appendices, and a useful and informative account of the early Christian teaching on prayer, which sets Origen's work in its historical context.

CHRIST THE CONQUEROR

RAGNAR LEIVESTAD — 25s. net

A full-scale and detailed study of the whole idea of conflict and victory in the New Testament, especially as it concerns the work and person of Christ. The investigation is not limited to strictly mythical ideas of conflict, but includes all that may reasonably be characterized as conflict and victory-motifs, and it distinguishes between the several distinct ways in which the triumph of Christ is treated in the New Testament.

A CHRISTIAN ECONOMY

W. G. PECK — 17s. 6d. net

Reproduces the essential elements of lectures given in recent years to various audiences. The nations stumble in economic confusion; and they will continue to do so unless the dogma of Communism is replaced in men's minds by the dogma of Christianity.

KERYGMA AND MYTH

Edited by Dr. H. W. BARTSCH

Translated by Prof. R. H. FULLER — 22s. 6d. net

The English translation of a series of essays by famous German theologians on the controversial subject of Rudolf Bultmann's proposals for demythologizing the New Testament, together with a final essay giving the views of a representative English theologian.

Again available

AGAPE AND EROS

ANDERS NYGREN. Authorized translation by PHILIP S. WATSON — 35s. net

"It is satisfactory to know that this important book is again available. Previously the English translation was in three volumes, and was to some extent abridged. We now have a complete text, in a single volume, and one translator. *Agape and Eros* is one of the few books that has made an almost universal mark on contemporary theology."—*Theology*.

THE PSALMS

Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes by W. O. E. OESTERLEY — 25s. net

This full-length Commentary on the Psalms, designed both for the advanced student and the general reader, has since its first publication in 1939 become recognized as a standard work in its field. Its re-issue in one volume makes Dr. Oesterley's work available once more in an even more convenient form.

PURITAN MANIFESTOES

A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt

Edited by W. H. FRERE and C. E. DOUGLAS — 21s. net

First published in 1907, and now re-issued with the original historical Introduction and text, but with a new preface by Professor Norman Sykes. It has long been out of print, but its usefulness continues and the material it presents has increased in importance in recent years.

(*Published for the Church Historical Society*)

S·P·C·K

WHEN WRITING TO ADVERTISERS PLEASE MENTION *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.*

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

In the perplexities of the contemporary situation many in the Church are turning with renewed earnestness to the Bible to see if there is any word from the Lord. All too often, however, we must confess ourselves to be disappointed. The Bible does not seem to supply—perhaps because it was never intended to supply—all that we expect from it. Moreover, before we can take what the Bible does supply we must put out of our hands some of the non-Biblical luggage which as twentieth-century men we are already carrying. This is an important point made in the first chapter of *The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society*, the second of the Ecumenical Biblical Studies published for the Study Department of the World Council of Churches by the Student Christian Movement.[1] The volume is the outcome of the work of a group of nearly twenty Biblical scholars from the various theological schools in the Chicago area; but responsibility for the final draft lies with Professor G. Ernest Wright of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

As an example of the discarding process which must precede an understanding of the meaning and relevance of the Biblical view of the relation between man and community we may take the prevalent modern conception, which is also an ancient conception, of the nature of the cosmos and of human society within it. Western civilization has been profoundly influenced by the Greek philosophers, to whom the world appeared as a harmonious whole, beautiful, good, and rational at bottom. In outward appearance, of course, the world is marred by change and decay, but essentially it is a rational, immutable, eternal structure, uncreated by god or gods. Man, moreover, participates in this essential structure. He is in himself a micro-cosmos, sharing the same contrast between superficial disorder and fundamental rationality, between the physical and the spiritual. Over against this Greek conception we must set the Biblical view of the world as God's creation, not eternal but perishable in its present form, alienated from its Creator under the sway of sin and death, and thus both the scene and the object of God's redemptive action.

Throughout the Middle Ages and the Reformation period the Biblical view was accepted as largely self-evident; but in more recent centuries the old Greek view has become dominant again, so that even Christians have come to take it as almost self-evident that there is a great orderly process in space and time proceeding of its own accord with society and man fundamentally in conformity with it.

The most important political convictions of Western man are rooted in this view of things. *Laissez-faire* capitalism, for example, has held that both the world in general and human society in particular are essentially a harmonious, rational structure. Elements of disorder are accidental, and will be no more than temporary, if only the individual is given complete freedom. At bottom, the cosmos, society, and the individual are all rational, and by an immanent law all will work together for ultimate harmony. Similarly, Marxism views the disorders of society as sin against the rational structure of the cosmos, and such sin consists chiefly in yielding to the interests of specific social classes. Man, however, is fundamentally rational, and by the concerted action of those who are awake to the situation there can be brought about the final revolution, in which the disorder and disharmony will be destroyed and a harmonious society will at last emerge. In like manner Utopian democracy believes in the essential rationality of the cosmos and of man, so that through science and education and free institutions the disorders should be gradually done away and a worthy society established.

Sometimes this Utopia, brought about by human rational effort, has been confused by Christians with the Kingdom of God. That is just as much a mistake as to elevate some specific race or nation or class to Divine rank. To deify any of the works of men's hands or any aspect of creation is idolatry. The Christian Church must therefore repudiate the convictions about man, society, and the world which underlie so much of modern political thinking. Only with a moderate democracy, which admits that there are grave elements of irrationality remaining, can the Biblical world-view be combined; and even then only with some qualification. Here the Christian Church has failed, in that, while denouncing the obvious forms of modern idolatry, she has been infected by more subtle paganisms appearing in idealistic dress. The result, as Professor Wright puts it, is that 'the ecumenical Church

[1] 7s. net.

has become increasingly and painfully aware that it does not possess that knowledge of the gospel and of its implications for the individual, social, and political life of our time which will enable it to speak with confidence either to itself or to the world.'

The way forward from this humiliating position would seem to lie through such studies as this, which seek to disentangle Biblical truth from secularized perversions, and to provide insights into aspects of the Bible that have often been neglected.

The man whose task it is to preach will ever turn with hope to every new book on preaching, for the preacher to the end of the day must be learning his business. The preacher who turns to Dr. A. C. CRAIG'S Warrack Lectures—*Preaching in a Scientific Age* [1]—will be rewarded.

Two chapters are specially interesting. In the chapter entitled 'The Dilemma of the Preacher' Dr. Craig deals with the situation in which the preacher finds himself to-day. Sunday congregations are markedly smaller. This is not all loss, for it represents 'a healthy sifting, an unmasking of conventional religiosity.'

Again, the modern congregation is less homogeneous in respect of a theological grasp of the faith. There is need for the preaching of doctrine 'and this has everything to say for itself over against round-the-year, butterfly-preaching—a perpetual incalculable fluttering from one flowery text to another.' But it must be remembered that there can be truth in the Chinese proverb which says 'that doctrine can catch truth, as a fisherman catches a fish, but truth dies in the net.' Doctrine plus experience is a necessity.

Thirdly, there is an ignorance in the modern congregation of the Bible and an uncertainty regarding its authority. The modern view of the Bible, a commonplace of the theological colleges, has never penetrated to the pew. Laymen hear whispers and echoes of it and are disturbed. 'They are like Polar explorers who waken up one morning to discover that their camp, instead of being pitched on the mainland, is adrift on an ice-floe.' One of the greatest needs is that knowledge should be passed on.

Fourthly, 'whatever else our generation believes or disbelieves, it believes in science.' Dr. CRAIG quotes W. A. Whitehouse's estimate of the scientific attitude. 'Provided men can be cured of stupidity, human nature, like the world itself, will slowly reach perfection here in history. And the cure for stupidity is education in the scientific attitude.' That is the situation in which the modern preacher finds himself.

There follow interesting and important chapters on 'Preaching and Biblical Criticism,' 'Preaching on Miracle,' and 'Preaching on the Resurrection.' But the final chapter, 'Preaching on the Last Things,' is of special interest.

Dr. CRAIG holds that preaching on the last things is somewhat neglected in our time. He says that towards the end of the War Prebendary James Welch declared that 'up to that date, out of all the war sermons preached on the British Broadcasting system, not one had been offered by any preacher of any denomination on the subject of immortality.' Dr. CRAIG lays down three principles. First, the nature of the Church on earth is not well symbolized by a circle centred on a single focus. 'A truer symbolic diagram is an ellipse centred on two foci—the secular and the eternal, the mundane and the mystical—which are not the centres of separate circles, but twin determinants of the Church's witness and task.' If we preach merely a social, this-worldly, gospel it becomes what Von Hügel called 'an irritating superfluity, a feeble ditto to the State.' Secondly, unless the preacher takes special care he will under-accent the other-worldly element in the Church's witness. He will do so because it is human nature to shut one's eyes to death, which is a thing at which no one wants to look. Thirdly, nowhere will lack of integrity be more damaging in its effect than in respect of the last things.

So Dr. CRAIG goes on to draw three practical conclusions. 'Through the appropriate Christian disciplines of meditation and prayer the preacher must be seeking to grow into the realization that mortal life must always be fatally *shadowed* unless it is lived *sub specie æternitatis*.' Time is always our enemy unless we remember eternity. 'The preacher must be learning in mind and heart that our mortal life must always be in danger of being morally *shallow* unless it is lived in the prospect of a final judgment at the bar of an absolute righteousness. . . . It is one thing to play chess against yourself—in that pastime you can make black or white win according as you please, and the record of the game will look all right, and yet be entirely phoney; it is quite another thing to face a personal opponent across the board who never abates the rigour of the game.' 'The preacher must be learning that the life on earth, despite all its width and depths of interest, is too *small* to satisfy the spirit God breathed into man.' Man, the child of eternity, needs eternity.

[1] S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net.

Important and Influential Foreign Books

Goguel's 'Life of Jesus'

By the Reverend C. Leslie Mitton, B.A., M.Th., Ph.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham

In 1933 Anderson Scott wrote of Maurice Goguel, Professor of Theology in the University of Paris, that 'his writings during the past thirty years have placed him in the front rank of French theological scholars.' That was more than twenty years ago, and ever since then Goguel has been continually putting students of the New Testament deeper in his debt through his many publications. Happily some of them are available in English, and more are becoming available. Only a few months ago his work on *La Naissance du Christianisme* appeared in an English translation, under the title *The Birth of Christianity*.

The first book, however, which made his scholarship available to English readers was his *Life of Jesus*. The French original, *La Vie de Jésus*, had been published in Paris in 1932. The English version was prepared with such expedition that it was published by Messrs. Allen and Unwin the year following. Goguel was fortunate to be introduced to English readers by so skilled a translator as Dr. Olive Wyon, who has since then put readers of theological books increasingly in her debt by many translations of the highest distinction from both French and German originals.

British reviewers did not greet the book with any flurry of trumpets. Approval of it was rather grudging, and criticism of it severe. A more shrewd commentary on its real worth is, however, the fact that it has been constantly gaining in stature ever since the time of its first appearance. Points of view, which appeared in this book as novel suggestions, have been steadily winning supporters; and, where he declined to be swept along by the strong thought-fashions of his day, he has proved a rallying point where others have found they could stand firm.

As one looks back at the criticisms made of this book in 1933, one feels that British critics were hardly aware of the theological situation on the Continent out of which Goguel wrote. He was working in an atmosphere of profound historical scepticism about the facts of the gospel narrative, and in the intellectual quicksands of the day he was striving painstakingly to find patches of solid rock, where he could begin to lay the foundation for a building that could not be shaken. Form Criticism on the Continent had become almost the current orthodoxy in scholastic circles, and Bultmann was arguing that the oral tradition, out of which the written Gospels were compiled, could not be traced further back than the communities which used them, and that it might well have been created by them, in order to provide an answer to their own problems. Bultmann argued, therefore, that we really could not claim to know anything about Jesus, but only what the Early Church believed about Him. He had written: 'We can no longer know the character of Jesus, his life, or his personality . . . there is not one of his words which we can regard as purely authentic. . . . We can sum up what can be known of the life and personality of Jesus as simply nothing.'

Such was the background against which Goguel wrote this book. This, however, was not the background of his British critics. This bleak winter of chilling scepticism had not yet reached this country. The word 'Form-Criticism' was still hardly mentioned in our theological lecture-rooms. We still were reading the warm, reassuring word-pictures of the historical Jesus, offered to us by T. R. Glover. So, by comparison, Goguel's book seemed niggardly and disappointing. But the real standard of comparison was not Glover but Bultmann. Goguel was attempting a task which most British readers had not realized to be necessary. He was diligently and tenaciously seeking for the bedrock of history in the gospel record, where, it was being said, only faith and not history was to be found.

A. J. Gossip in *The Expository Times* (xliv. [October 1932] 43) joined in the adverse criticism: 'The book is able, but external, academic, cold.' He also complained, as other reviewers did, of the inordinate length of the prolegomena. He challenged, rightly, the lopsided character of a book on Jesus, which out of five hundred and eighty-eight pages gave only six to His moral teaching. But with the criticisms, he, unlike some other reviewers, put his finger on the real value of the book. He recognized that it was 'built up on the plan of furnishing an indispensable minimum which may easily be enriched and enlarged, but which cannot be challenged.' From our later vantage point, that seems a very shrewd assessment of its worth. It is indeed an attempt

to establish the 'indispensable minimum' of historical fact in the gospel record, the solid nucleus which cannot be reduced, though it may be greatly augmented.

The bleak east winds of historical scepticism were soon to reach this country and send a chill shiver down many spines. R. H. Lightfoot, one of our leading exponents of Form Criticism, was soon to write those oft-quoted, disconcerting words: 'The form of the earthly Christ is . . . for the most part hidden from us.' When this kind of thing began to be written among us, we were in a better position to understand the starting point of Goguel's book. What, in the book, had at first seemed almost like a cavalier abandonment of some of the treasured features of the gospel narrative began to appear in its true light, as a conscientious endeavour to reclaim, step by step, the fundamental historicity of that narrative, in defiance of those who almost casually were prepared to abandon it altogether.

The most remarkable thing about this book, however, is not the cold impartiality of its judgments, but the fact that it was written at all. Goguel's decision to publish a Life of Christ just then was an act of deliberate defiance to the whole trend of contemporary scholarship. Even the more moderate of the Form Critics, who would have declined to follow Bultmann in proclaiming the unhistorical character of most of the gospel material, nevertheless argued that it consisted of small and originally unrelated units, which the Evangelists had pieced together at a later date in accordance with some artificial and arbitrary scheme. The original sequence of events was irrevocably lost. Even comparatively conservative scholars were sadly acknowledging that a Life of Christ could no longer be written since the materials to make it possible did not exist. The wide currency of this belief is shown by the fact that apart from Goguel's book, no Life of Jesus appeared in the second quarter of this century.[1] It was just at this time that Goguel took his reputation in his hands and wrote such a Life. Now, twenty years later, timidly but with growing confidence, others are once again daring to attempt what he dared to do. A. M. Hunter cautiously pioneered the way a little in his *The Work and Words of Jesus*, and H. E. W. Turner, in *Jesus, Master and Lord*, tackled the task on a more substantial scale. Now we look forward to the forthcoming book from the pen of Vincent Taylor, who, after writing his monumental commentary on *St. Mark*, is well prepared to reconstruct for us the story of the Life and Ministry of Jesus, as he has come to understand it. So where Goguel stood alone for nearly a quarter of a century, others are now able to stand. His book, which to many seemed at first unnecessarily critical, has in fact been a kind of bulwark against the mood of extreme historical scepticism which threatened to engulf New Testament scholarship.

It was this awareness that every step in his historical reconstruction would be vehemently challenged that caused Goguel to devote nearly half of his long book to prolegomena. To British readers, with no serious doubts about the fundamental reliability of the historical pattern of the Gospels, this seemed provokingly unnecessary. But Goguel is carefully testing his materials, and choosing only what can be fully relied on. He feels he must answer patiently and painstakingly even those who deny the historicity of Jesus altogether, or argue that the story of His life is only a 'myth.'

So he gathers together what we may learn of Jesus from non-Christian sources, and gives an admirable summary of what we may discover about His earthly life from the writings of Paul. He then proceeds, with shrewd discernment, to characterize the Gospels and their mutual relationships. He accepts the view that Mark lies behind both Matthew and Luke, though probably in an earlier form than the copy of Mark which stands in our New Testament. What we normally speak of as 'Q' he identifies with the 'Logia' of the famous saying of Papias, and writes of it: 'For my own part, I regard it less as a literary source than a collection which was continually being enlarged by the introduction of sayings of Jesus scattered through tradition. Hence the Logia themselves are also very varied. Matthew and Luke knew this collection in two different forms.' Concerning the Fourth Gospel he writes: 'It is a collection of independent incidents, selected in order to throw light on various aspects of Christian truth. It is a series of meditations on the Gospel story set in a framework composed of narratives.' But though he treats John as interpreting rather than recording events and sayings, he also shows great discernment in detecting historical memories embedded in the Gospel. He writes: 'The historical value of John's narrative does not lie in its framework nor in its general construction, but in the traditional material which it has used.' With great skill he uses these historical memories to supplement and correct the outline of events as recorded by Mark. In particular he uses the Fourth Gospel to expand what the Synoptics record about a ministry in Jerusalem, the relations of Jesus' disciples with John the Baptist, and the closing ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem, and the sequence of events which led to His trial and death.

[1] Perhaps, however, C. J. Cadoux's *The Historic Mission of Jesus* should be counted as a Life of Jesus.

Next there comes an important chapter where the commonly accepted solution of the Synoptic problem is used in the interests of historical investigation. He analyses the modifications which Matthew and Luke make in the Markan narrative, and so specifies certain recognizable lines along which the historical truth tended to be adjusted to accord with the practices of the Primitive Church or the growing sense of reverence for the Person of Christ which then prevailed. Here, as in the Apocryphal Gospels, he argues, we see 'tendencies which determined the development of the Gospel tradition . . . as though placed under a magnifying glass.' In this way some late intrusions into the story can be recognized and removed, and in what remains a larger proportion of historical fact is left.

Included in these protracted Prolegomena is a long and important chapter on 'Problems and Method,' a most important feature of which is the establishing of certain 'tests of authenticity.' These are permanent gains for the historian. They provide valid means by which what is original in the tradition may be distinguished from later additions. He argues, for instance, that those features of the tradition which the Early Church found hard to assimilate bear the mark of authenticity, for instance the association of Jesus with Nazareth, and His acceptance of baptism at the hands of John. The words of Jesus which restrict His mission to Israel are declared to be authentic, because they are opposed to the actual practice of the Church. The reference of Jesus to His coming in the clouds of heaven, without any hint of the Resurrection, must be authentic, because the Early Church, had it invented the saying, would not have omitted the Resurrection. This is 'a criterion which permits us to establish the authenticity of some of the sayings of Jesus.' He adds a wise caution that the converse does not apply, and that it by no means follows that the sayings of Jesus 'which are in harmony with the conceptions of Christianity of the Apostolic Age are not authentic.'

Another test of authenticity is the inward consistency which marks the thoughts and words of a great teacher. 'The sayings of Jesus whose authenticity can be established can, in their turn, serve as a touchstone for estimating the authenticity of other sayings. The sayings which are authentic become centres of crystallization around which the other reliable elements of the tradition gather.' Working on this principle he claims: 'It is not difficult to discern in the words attributed to Jesus those which are only a projection into the past of the faith of the Church. The thought of Jesus . . . is peculiarly simple and coherent in character.' At this point he calls Bultmann's own writings as witness against that author's historical scepticism, for of that writer's account of the thought of Jesus he writes, that it 'is so connected, and represents so personal a way of thinking that it is difficult to see how it could be understood as a collective way of thought.'

Goguel is not prepared to stand by the historical validity of the so-called 'nature' miracles, though he is cautious in his definition of 'miracle'—'A fact could not be described objectively as a miracle save by some one who knew all the laws of nature.' He notes the tendency of the Apocryphal Gospels to create miracles, and of some of the Nature miracles he writes that 'they are of primary importance in the history of Christian thought, and mean nothing in the actual record of the life of Jesus.' He attaches considerable importance to the saying of Jesus in Mk 8^{11-12}, where, in reply to a demand for a sign to serve as His credential, He says: 'There shall no sign be given unto this generation.' Of these words, Goguel adds: 'This saying is certainly authentic, for it could not have been created by primitive Christianity which attached a great importance to the miracles of Jesus. . . . It leads us to think that Jesus did not want to work marvels, that is to say, as acts of pure display.' The healing miracles he places in a different category, because 'there can be no doubt that Jesus did heal the sick.'

That brings us to p. 222, and perhaps the prolegomena may be said to end there, though the author still prefers to reach a decision on certain specific features of the ministry before starting a consecutive story. He feels able to fix the date of the death of Jesus at the Passover of A.D. 28. He discusses the length of the ministry, contrasting the apparent length of it in the Synoptic narrative, where only one Passover is mentioned, and that in the Fourth Gospel where three are referred to, as though the ministry lasted at any rate longer than two years. He believes that the Fourth Gospel retains a reliable tradition in linking much of the Lord's ministry with Jerusalem, and in particular uses the evidence of the Fourth Gospel most skilfully to reconstruct the developments in the last few months of the life of Jesus. This is the sequence of events he proposes (p. 250): 'Jesus left Galilee at the moment of the Feast of Tabernacles, somewhere in September or October (John vii. 2); he stayed in Jerusalem until the Feast of the Dedication in December (John x. 22); then he left the city in order to withdraw to a remote place on the other side of Jordan (John x. 40, cf. xi. 54). He returned to Jerusalem on the eve of the Feast of the Passover (John xii. 1). Then events moved swiftly. Jesus was arrested, and a few hours later crucified.'

This reconstruction of the story is further substantiated on pp. 409–437. This extension of the final visit of Jesus to Jerusalem from the period of five days, as Mark represents it, to one of six months (though interrupted by an absence of three months spent on the east of Jordan) certainly accords with some features even in the Synoptic narrative. It absolves us, for instance, from the necessity of trying to pack into the short space of four days the Triumphal Entry, the Cleansing of the Temple, and all the gathering of the storm which finally overwhelmed Jesus in death.

It is a most interesting feature of recent studies of the subject that this particular reconstruction of Goguel is being taken up by other scholars. Both T. W. Manson and Vincent Taylor now adopt what is substantially the same pattern of events.

In his account of the Ministry of Jesus, Goguel follows the main outline of Mark, though he sees some degree of artificiality in it. He finds the starting point of the public ministry, however, not, as Mk 1^{14} represents it, at the moment when John the Baptist was thrown into prison, but in an acute difference of opinion with John, which led to their separation. The early stages of the Galilean ministry met with considerable popular success. Then hostility from the Pharisees and Sadducees was roused, and numerous clashes with them took place. Herod is also ranged against Jesus, and makes plans to kill Him. In this period the message of Jesus has been addressed specifically to the Jewish people. It can be summarized as the proclamation that He had come to announce to the Jews that God willed, by the free gift of His love, ' to open to repentant men the gates of the coming Kingdom . . . whose members would obey God wholly, and would realize the divine perfection in their own lives.' Then follows a period when Jesus is moving from place to place, mainly outside Galilee, to avoid the hostile attentions of Herod. In this period occur the Feeding of the Multitude, and the Confession at Cæsarea Philippi. (Still seeking the sure ground of authenticity, he argues: ' The fact that Cæsarea Philippi is mentioned may be regarded as proof that the incident belongs to the primitive tradition,' since apart from this incident the town holds no further interest for the reader.) From this point, words of foreboding begin to come from the lips of Jesus, about houses divided on the issue of loyalty to Him, and of persecution, and strife, and of His own coming suffering. Then at last comes the departure for Jerusalem, and later the dreadful climax there.

On the question of whether Jesus was crucified on the actual day of the Passover, as the Synoptics suggest, or on the previous day, as the Fourth Gospel asserts, Goguel strongly favours the accuracy of the Johannine tradition. On the actual form of the Last Supper, he decides in favour of the shorter version of Luke's account, with the cup first and the bread second (and no second cup), as Otto also did in *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man.*

Goguel is not willing to accept as historical either the account of Jesus' appearance before Herod in the Trial, or the incident involving Barabbas, and, very significantly, his story of the Life of Jesus ends with His death, and stops short of the Resurrection. We can understand why he does this when we read in his *The Birth of Christianity* what he understands by the Resurrection: ' The resurrection of Jesus is in reality the resurrection of that faith in him which the disciples had had during his ministry.' ' Originally the expression of an experience, it assumed the character of a factual history.' This seems a very unconvincing account of that which created the Early Church with its irrepressible vitality, but it explains why Goguel felt it necessary to conclude his Life of Jesus with the Crucifixion.

Interposed in the story of the Life is a brief chapter on the Teaching of Jesus. It comprises only twenty-eight pages, and even then its title is: ' The Form of the Teaching of Jesus.' It is a valuable chapter, and we should note that it does not even claim to speak of the contents of the Teaching. But can a Life of Jesus be written which does not take far greater account of the Teaching? Was not Gossip abundantly justified in his complaint that only six pages deal with the moral teaching of Jesus? The author might argue in return that his book did not set out to give an account of the Teaching, but the omission is ' symptomatic ' (to borrow Gossip's word) of a recent trend in New Testament scholarship. Eschatology has dominated the scene. Schweitzer's dictum that the moral teaching of Jesus was merely an Interim Ethic, though often criticised, has continually influenced other writers so that they show less than proper regard for the unmistakably strong ethical note in the Teaching of Jesus.

Goguel would rank in this book as a thoroughgoing eschatologist, and in this respect is closer to Schweitzer than to Otto. Otto's powerful argument for an element in the teaching of Jesus of what we have come to know as ' realized eschatology ' had not yet appeared in print, but Goguel shows himself unsympathetic towards it. He argues, rather unconvincingly, that because such a thought is not to be found in the eschatology of Judaism, therefore it is unlikely to be present in the words of Jesus. But surely it is not being unduly credulous to believe it possible that new

ways of looking at old truths may have come to us through Jesus. Goguel, however, seeks to interpret the words of Jesus within the sphere of thoroughgoing eschatology, but this does not mean that he wishes to saddle the Church with that point of view. On the contrary he sees it as an element which appeared quite naturally in the teaching of Jesus from the environment in which He lived, but which needs to be translated for modern Christians into a current equivalent. 'Though Jesus thought in eschatological terms just as he spoke in Aramaic, that which is most intimate and essential in his thought may not be connected any more closely with eschatological thought than with the Aramaic tongue.'

If the reader wants a Life of Jesus which will minister to his periods of private devotion we do not recommend this book; nor is it a book for a preacher who is looking for material for sermons; nor will its worth be appreciated by one who is accustomed to assume that, though small inaccuracies and discrepancies may be found in the gospel material, nevertheless they are substantially reliable, just as they are, as factual history. But if anyone has been faced with the radical criticism of scholars like Bultmann, and has been disconcerted to find the word 'myth' applied not only to the incidents in the opening chapters of Genesis, but also to some of the most precious episodes in the Synoptic Gospels, and if he, in the general uncertainty created by these extremes of criticism, wants to find what in the Gospels can be relied on as indisputably historical, and yet does not want to be fobbed off with merely pious affirmations, for such a one this is a book to be studied. It is a measure of its calibre that it speaks more directly to the need of British readers to-day than when it first appeared twenty years ago. Here the reader will find ruthless honesty. The author writes: 'If our conceptions or our philosophical or religious opinions are contradicted by the facts, the facts must not be altered or camouflaged in order to secure agreement, but our opinions must be either abandoned or corrected.' This resolute truthfulness can be very disconcerting, but there is a fine antiseptic quality in it, and truth when it is shown to be truth is always the ally of true religion.

Again we return to the wise words of A. J. Gossip. What Goguel offers us in this Life of Jesus is not the sum total of all that is available, but the 'indispensable' (and we might add, irreducible) 'minimum.' Where all seemed unsure and shifting, he drove in the piles, deep and sure, upon which a strong edifice could be built. That edifice, a scrupulously honest outline of the Life and Ministry of Jesus, he himself began to build, and others will be able, indeed are now able, to continue the more confidently, because of his beginning.

Literature

THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

THE present Ecumenical Movement will hold a place among the determinative movements in Christian history, and the Church's red-letter dates will include Edinburgh 1910 and Amsterdam 1948. But the ideal of Unity is no newer than the ideal of Peace, nor does approach to the one prove easier than approach to the other, while the content of both words has changed with the centuries. Amsterdam 1948 has not settled the problem of Christian Unity, but it provides an opportunity for pausing to survey the Church's interest in and efforts after a condition so plainly in accordance with the mind of Christ. Such a study is presented on an elaborate scale through the initiative of the Ecumenical Institute of Bossey and under the experienced editorship of Miss Ruth Rouse and Bishop Stephen Neill, with the title *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517–1948* (S.P.C.K.; 32s. 6d. net).

The contributors have been carefully chosen as expert in their particular fields, and well-organized co-operation has produced 'a genuinely ecumenical effort.' The Introduction makes it clear that the Church did not live in blissful unity before the Lutheran eruption, and reminds us of such unity attempts as that of the Inquisition and of 'watery unions' that proved unhelpful. Professor J. T. McNeill is responsible for a learned chapter on the period 1517–1618, and Professor Norman Sykes writes in his interesting manner of developments in Britain in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. There is a study of the Eastern Orthodox attitude by Professor Florovsky, and H. R. T. Brandreth discusses nineteenth-century approaches, while Professor Latourette writes on missionary influences, Tissington Tatlow on Lausanne and other Faith and Order assaults on theological obstacles, and Bishop Neill on practical twentieth-century attempts at union. Dr. Visser 't Hooft, Secretary of the World Council of Churches, treats of the genesis of that body. An extensive and classified Bibliography is provided. The Explanatory Notes will be useful, though the note on the Covenants, for example, is far from correct.

This volume will now be a necessary part of the equipment of any one concerned for Christian Unity. The story is naturally one-sided as that of any movement must be, and there are, of course, enthusiasts who, carried away by the community drift of our time, forget that one might write Church History with a Crocean bias as the story of liberty, realizing that Christianity has brought not only rest and security but also revolution, appreciating the positive value of independent thought in some so-called heretics, knowing that uniformity is another word for stagnation, and believing that union justifies itself by being not merely a mark attained but the beginning of new advance, not just the response to a practical emergency, or a concession to communities without a past, or an escapist retreat to authority, or even evidence of deepening charity, but an essential prerequisite to more adequate and effective witness. One rejoices that the volume reveals so much overcoming of misunderstanding among professing Christians, but regrets indications of how little the ecumenical spirit has penetrated beyond denominational leaders.

G. D. Henderson

CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA

In this book—*Church of South India*, by Professor Bengt Sundkler (Lutterworth Press; 25s. net), a source book of considerable dimensions, revealing much painstaking study by a Swedish Professor of Uppsala University, and complete with elaborate notes and bibliographies—the author describes the movement towards Church union between 1900 and 1947. On an early page he asks the question, 'Is not the deepest problem of Church union this: How to find redemption for the wrongs of history without renouncing history?' He answers the question most faithfully, both by his method and by his selection of the facts, which he shows to be in themselves the supreme answer to the question. Perhaps one might be tempted to suggest that the treatment of the controversy is over-elaborate, and that some of the lesser details might quite well have been left in oblivion. But on the other hand we must remember the vast importance of their half-century of pre-union history to those who have so recently entered triumphantly into their inheritance, and many of the incidents so carefully related may be both a warning and an encouragement to others farther afield who are ecumenically inclined—more or less. Dr. Sundkler sets forth clearly the various influences which helped to determine the form of the South Indian union, and shows how men of the three main types—Congregational, Presbyterian, and Episcopal—were so brought together as to feel at home in their new, or rather new-old, Church. The *fact* of the Church of South India is, he thinks, the key to the understanding of the whole development, realizing as it did the biological principle of 'anticipatory substitution,' with its deeper significance of the temporary use of an organ until a better could be found, or the extension of an office beyond its primary significance until more specific authority could be agreed upon. A definite stimulus pointing towards unity is assigned to 'Edinburgh 1910,' which—in the words of Gresford Jones—'tacitly yet emphatically revealed the colossal absurdity of non-union'; and in the course of the dramatic narrative the contributions of the different sections of the Christian community are indicated and certain leaders stand forth conspicuously. Discussions about inter-communion and parity of ministry, about the relation of the historic episcopate to apostolic succession, cease to be merely wordy debates, are raised to a higher level through the influence of the Pentecostal spirit upon a Church in action, and are seen to be parts of an endeavour—as Bishop Palmer puts it—'to seek a plan which already exists in the mind of God.' So the book comes naturally—and one might almost say inevitably—to the climax of 1947, to the conclusion of a movement in which those who took part were conscious throughout of Divine leading, of reaching an end which in the history of the Church Universal was also to be a new beginning.

W. S. Urquhart

THREE TYNDALE LECTURES

Three Tyndale Lectures delivered in Selwyn College, Cambridge, in July last year have now been published in booklet form. They are the Theology Lecture, by Professor John Murray, of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, on *The Covenant of Grace*; the Old Testament Lecture, by the Rev. H. L. Ellison, B.A., B.D., of the London Bible College, on *The Centrality of the Messianic Idea for the Old Testament*; and the New Testament Lecture, by Vice-Principal J. W. Wenham, M.A., B.D., of Tyndale Hall, Bristol, on *Our Lord's View of the Old Testament* (Tyndale Press; 1s. 6d. net each).

Professor Murray's study is solidly Biblico-theological. He admits that there is always 'need for correction and reconstruction' in theology, and, starting from the Reformation emphasis on covenant as 'a compact or agreement between two parties,' shows conclusively that the idea of contract not only does less than justice to the covenants of the Bible, but is even misleading.

Even in the Noahic covenant 'we have covenant in the purity of its conception as a dispensation of grace to men, wholly divine in its origin, fulfilment, and confirmation.' There is no essential difference between the covenants of the Old Testament and the new covenant in Christ. 'As covenant revelation has progressed throughout the ages it has reached its consummation in the new covenant and the new covenant is not wholly diverse in principle and character from the covenants which have preceded it and prepared for it but is itself the complete realization and embodiment of that sovereign grace which was the constitutive principle of all the covenants.' This is quite in line with contemporary critical study of the Old Testament.

The Biblical Lectures also give the impression that a measure of common agreement is not impossible between conservative and 'critical' scholars. Mr. Ellison's two assumptions that 'we must look to Sinai and not to the eighth-century prophets for the true beginnings of Israel's religion,' and that we must 'further reject the conception that all the older writings of the Old Testament have been so radically edited by post-exilic priestly writers as completely to eradicate elements which contradicted their conceptions of what should have been,' would be almost unanimously endorsed to-day.

Mr. Wenham's study must command the respect and sympathy of many whose views on Biblical-critical questions he probably does not share. Sometimes he appears to be in a conflict of loyalties. He says: 'Not only do I instinctively recoil from any conclusion that would inseparably tie up the truth of the Christian faith with an acceptance of the Book of Jonah as history, but I also realize that much of the Bible is non-literal in form: it abounds in poetry and parable and symbol. When, therefore, I find learned scholars earnestly arguing that Jonah was never intended to be regarded as history, my inclination is to believe them.' He further seems to admit the cogency of a note by Perowne on the Book of Jonah: 'And yet we are to suppose Him [our Lord] to say that imaginary persons who at the imaginary preaching of an imaginary prophet repented in imagination, shall rise up in that day and condemn the actual impenitence of those his actual hearers.' Notwithstanding, Mr. Wenham feels obliged to say: 'It may not be impossible to take this as midrash or allegory, yet I find it most difficult to avoid the conclusion that this and several other passages are deprived of their force if their historical basis is removed, and in all honesty I can see no hint that our Lord intended Himself to be taken anything but literally.' His general conclusion from a study of the New Testament is: 'The evidence is clear: To Christ the Old Testament was true, authoritative, inspired. To Him the God of the Old Testament was the living God and the teaching of the Old Testament was the teaching of the living God. To Him, what Scripture said, God said.' To this, again, we should all say, 'Agreed!' But then we turn back to Mr. Wenham's Introduction: 'Nor shall we tackle the question of the authority to be given to our Lord's view of Scripture once that view has been discovered. The problems of Kenosis are of supreme importance, but they come outside our subject and we shall not attempt to grapple with them.' No one would expect him to do this. But it is precisely there that our difficulties begin.

It is much to be desired that these Tyndale Lectures will be widely read. They have the quality of eirenica and as such are calculated to promote mutual understanding.

C. R. North

---

1 MACCABEES

A new series, 'Blackwell's Theological Texts,' under the general editorship of Professor G. D. Kilpatrick, D.D., has got off to a good start with *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees*, by Mr. J. C. Dancy, M.A., Headmaster of Lancing College (18s. net). There was need for such a work. 1 Maccabees does for the period between the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes (175–174 B.C.) and the death of Simon (134 B.C.) what the Books of Samuel and Kings do for an earlier age. Nor are the events of the apocryphal book less momentous, for the struggle in the second century for religious liberty and political independence probably involved the continuance of Judaism and the appearance of Christianity. Yet until recently students studying this source have had to make do with the Commentary in 'The Cambridge Bible' by Fairweather and Black which came out in 1897. In 1949 there appeared Abel's comprehensive Commentary, *Les Livres des Maccabées*, and in the following year Zeitlin's edition of Rahlfs' Greek text with an English translation by Tedesche. But for the student Abel's notes are too full while those of Zeitlin are hardly full enough. Mr. Dancy, by omitting the text—the R.V. is the basis of his Commentary—is able to expand his notes and yet keep the whole book within some two hundred pages.

In his Introduction Mr. Dancy deals with 1 and 2 Maccabees and other historical sources as well as with the general historical background. Particularly useful are the sections on chronology. The notes form 'an historical commentary on the English text.' Readers of the Greek will also find them helpful; they will be less so to those

concerned to understand the underlying Semitic text, for reference to this is given only occasionally and not always very happily, for example, read 'am for Am (p. 165). Sometimes a note might be questioned or perhaps amplified with gain, for example, at 6^{34} the 'blood of grapes' is taken to indicate autumn as the time of the battle. This ignores the possibility that wine is intended and takes no account of the conjecture that the elephants were not only shown it but given it to drink. A note might have been added on 6^{36} to make clear how the picked horsemen acted in relation to the elephants. Zeitlin, not Tedesche, was responsible for the textual material and commentary in the volume noted above (cf. p. 52). Too often, for a text-book, reference to other works takes the place of discussion, for example, a reader might expect some treatment in detail of the term 'Maccabee' instead of little more than a reference to Zeitlin's work (cf. p. 11).

But such examples of the slight imperfections of this volume should not be allowed to hide its real merits. The evidence adduced, particularly from extra-Biblical writings and from numismatics, and Mr. Dancy's balanced scholarship combine to make this book a real contribution to the study of 1 Maccabees.

W. D. McHardy

PURITANISM AND BAXTER

Puritanism still has a bad name, and for that one must chiefly blame the misrepresentations of writers who ought to have known better. Macaulay's epigram, 'The Puritan hated bear baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators,' has scarcely any justification. In fact, the Puritans put forward two or three good reasons for objecting to such sports. Similarly, the festivities connected with the maypole were not all so innocent as picture postcard illustrations may suggest.

For a well-balanced attempt to present the truth about the Puritans we heartily commend *Puritanism and Richard Baxter*, by the Rev. Hugh Martin, D.D. (S.C.M.; 15s. net). Dr. Martin divides his book into three parts, dealing with the history of English Puritanism, aspects of Puritanism, and Richard Baxter. The justification for making Baxter so prominent is that he was a great Christian whose influence long continued potent and is not exhausted yet, and, as Dr. Martin says, 'he is especially a representative of Puritanism at its central, moderate best.'

Moreover, Baxter had many interests which make him congenial to a modern Christian. In a day of bitter divisions in the Church he took the way indicated by his own quotation from Rupert Meldeniŭs: 'Unity in things necessary; liberty in things unnecessary; and charity in all.' He even perceived that foreign missions might have a bearing on Christian unity. Further, he was a seeker after social justice, whose stout and detailed assertion that Christian standards apply to business as much as to anything else contradict the Weber thesis as to the connexion of Puritanism with social individualism and capitalism.

Dr. Martin has read widely and his judgments on Puritanism's relation to the arts, toleration, etc. may be taken as well-founded. Notes, index, and bibliography are good. To the last there might be added Dr. R. S. Bosher's recent study of the influence of the Laudians on the making of the Restoration Settlement.

Stewart Mechie

CONSTANTINE TO THEODOSIUS

Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius, by Professor S. L. Greenslade, D.D. (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net), is a slim but important volume. It contains the substance of the Frederick Denison Maurice Lecture given at King's College, London, in 1953. It was never really possible for Rome to follow a policy of universal religious toleration. There had always been a State religion, the correct observance of which was important for the welfare of the nation. From the beginning, therefore, Christianity could not merely win toleration; it had to win supremacy or nothing. The hopes of the Church under Constantine were high. Eusebius had it that 'As Christ, the Word of God, the Logos, is the archetypal image of the Father, so on earth Constantine is the image of the Logos.' The Logos is pre-eminently present in him. This meant that from the beginning the Emperor is deeply involved in the Church. The course of the relationship between Church and State took a discernible form. There were three possibilities. The Emperor could be in full control of the Church as he was of the State. 'When the bishops at Milan in 355 demurred and referred to canons, Constantius (Athanasius tells us) said: "Whatever I will, let that be esteemed a canon."' Optatus held that the Church is within the State, and not the State within the Church. 'No one,' he said, 'is above the Emperor except God alone who made him Emperor.' Second, there can be between Church and State a dualist relationship, in which the State deals with the things that are Cæsar's and the Church with the things that are God's. Hosius of Cordova wrote to Constantius saying: 'God has put into your hands the kingdom; to us He has entrusted the affairs of His Church; and as he who would steal the empire from you would resist the ordinance of

God, so likewise fear on your part lest, by taking upon yourself the government of the Church, you become guilty of a great offence.' This was the point of view of Ambrose. To Valentinian II he writes: 'Do not deceive yourself, Sir, with the fancy that you have any imperial right over divine things.' The third possible relationship is the relationship in which the Church claims supremacy over the State. It is always difficult to tell where Cæsar's things stop and where God's begin. Any question in the last analysis has a moral basis. In the end Ambrose's theoretical dualist outlook became an outlook which demanded the supremacy of the Church, for it was for a political crime that he debarred Theodosius from his own Church. The influence of the Church became specially strong and dominant when the Church was able to apply moral sanctions like that.

Dr. Greenslade tells this story with a wealth of learning, with careful documentation, with sound judgment, and with an outstanding gift for lucidly marshalling the facts. He does not tell us much about his own view of the matter, but what he does say is wise and suggestive.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

UGARITIC MARRIAGE

An unusual study of the Ras Shamra texts so far published has been made by Professor A. van Selms, D.D., of the University of Pretoria, and issued under the title, *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature* (Luzac; 20s. net). The difficulty attending the study lies in the fact that no Ugaritic code of laws has yet been brought to light, and most of the material here studied is to be found in the mythological or epic texts. Professor van Selms uses this with due reserve, though he thinks it is likely that it reflects the customs of Ugarit, though projected into the accounts of the gods. Many of the terms and expressions are philologically akin to terms and expressions in the Old Testament or in Accadian literature, but there are also many which are not known elsewhere, and their meaning has often to be guessed, and is differently guessed by different interpreters. The author has read widely in the vast literature about these texts that has come into being during the last twenty-five years, and he guides the reader, especially in his extensive footnotes, amongst this literature and through the discussions of individual points. He studies the various forms of marriage and sexual relations, and in particular the preparations for marriage, the wedding, married life, the family, death, burial and mourning, and inheritance. He reaches the conclusion that two different forms of marriage, representing an older and a younger conception of the family, are reflected here. He finds a number of institutions and ceremonies which are unparalleled elsewhere in the ancient Near East, so far as our knowledge goes, of which the possibility of daughters being made heirs to the exclusion of sons is perhaps the most interesting. Incidentally the use of rouge is mentioned only in connexion with men, and Dr. van Selms thinks this cosmetic may have been reserved for men, and only when they went out to battle. It is too much to hope that on texts which are often so cryptic and which are so variously interpreted the views here presented will be accepted on all points, but it is certain that this brave and scholarly study will be of high value to succeeding investigators and the student of the Old Testament will find constant parallels to things found in the Bible.

H. H. ROWLEY

Professor Ilion T. Jones, D.D., who holds the Chair of Practical Theology in San Francisco Theological Seminary, presents us with a sizeable book — *A Historical Approach to Evangelical Worship* (Abingdon Press; $4.50). He writes clearly with very adequate knowledge of the history of Christian Public Worship from the early days to the Reformation and of what he regards as dangerous trends in Protestant Worship since the middle of last century. His book on the practical side is an admonition to some Protestants to consider whither they are going. Probably unaware of what they are doing, they threaten the whole Protestant position. The Reformation, he reminds us, was to a great extent due to a revolt against what Worship had become. Yet we find Protestants to-day bringing back the very features which the sixteenth-century reformed. They are setting the 'high altar' against the eastern wall of the church while very curiously the Roman Church is removing it thence. They talk of priests instead of ministers. They are railing off the chancel from the congregation, and so on, in manifold ways in their worship distinguishing in an utterly wrong way between clergy and laity.

On the whole many of us will agree with Dr. Jones. We may also agree as to some points that his own anticipated criticism of lapse into triviality is not unsound. He wants us to stop using the word 'Saint' as applied either to an individual or to a church building. So we must no longer speak of our venerable churches as St. Paul's, London, or St. Giles', Edinburgh. We must decline to accompany the Professor quite all that way.

Professor Alban G. Widgery is very cautious and non-committal in *What is Religion?* (Allen and Unwin; 18s. net). He poses at the outset the well-worn Kantian question as to why philosophy has not made the same rapid progress as science, and his explanation is a suggestion that science has 'got above itself,' and, having been exceedingly successful in the employment of measurement and definite experiment, has illogically adopted the position that nothing is of importance to which such methods cannot be applied. Another hindrance at the present time is, he thinks, the mentality of the neo-orthodox theologian, which he regards—with considerable justification—as indicating philosophically a failure of nerve.

Dr. Widgery's own position is dualistic, neither naturalistic nor idealistic, but comprehensive of both. His answer to the question of the title rather frequently reminds one of the Scottish legal verdict of non-proven; but his bias is very obviously in favour of giving a specific place in philosophy to the religious consciousness, and he repeatedly and very earnestly pleads for the objective and metaphysical value of revelation and inspiration. He deprecates excessive intellectualism and holds that religion is worthless unless it is based on experience, comprehensive and interpretative of the actual world in which we live. His arguments from this point of view are valuable and cogent, but he becomes vehemently dogmatic in his rejection of belief in the primary value of any one religion, and he goes the length of saying that the requisite degree of impartiality is almost, though not quite, impossible for one who is a 'committed' adherent of any particular religion. This detached attitude, while it may be a widely prevalent present-day fashion, is hardly consistent with the conspicuously fair-minded consideration of differing points of view which is characteristic of this book as a whole.

Canon F. W. B. Bullock, Ph.D., B.D., has published the second volume of his *History of Ridley Hall, Cambridge*. This covers the years from 1908 to 1951. It will be remembered that the first volume, which came out in 1941, covered the history of the Hall under the first two Principals—Handley Moule and Thomas Wortley Drury. This volume deals with the time of Dr. Tait, J. P. S. R. Gibson, and Dr. S. F. Allison. It will doubtless have a strong appeal to all old Ridleians, but it will surely be read also by students of the Evangelical Movement generally. There is nothing sensational in it, but it is a full, patient, factual record which cannot fail to be impressive.

It may be obtained from the Principal, Ridley Hall, Cambridge, price 26s. net. Alas! the price has risen from the first volume, copies of which are still available at 18s. net.

Readers of this magazine will recognize some of the prayers in *The Throne of Grace*, by the Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc. (Church of Scotland Publications Department; 6s. net), for they have already appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. The prayers are printed in a quite unusual way, so that they appear like poems in prose. This is both effective and useful. The book has four sections—Prayers at Public Worship, Intercessions in Public Worship, A Christian Marriage Ceremony, and School Devotions. These prayers are all written in language which is choice and beautiful and carefully wrought. They preserve all the beauty and the dignity which should be in public prayer, and they attain to reality by avoiding all hackneyed and outworn phraseology. The School Services on The Beatitudes and on The Lord's Prayer are specially useful. Here is one of the prayers of invocation:

Grant, O God, in this hour of worship,
that, like the disciples on the high mountain
who saw the transfiguration of their Lord,
we may pass beyond the letter of the law,
and rise above the words of prophecy,
and being fully awake,
may look upon the glory of Thy Beloved Son,
and hear His word. Amen.

The combined beauty and freshness of Mr. Stewart's prayers can be seen in a passage like this:

Keep us in the ways of honour,
so that we may dodge no duty, shirk no burden,
snatch not at any greedy advantage,
evade no fair demand, betray no friend.

The poetry of the prose may be seen in a passage like this:

We need Thee in the morning of our days,
when life is full of hope;
and midway in our course,
when the work is great and the load is heavy;
and still we need Thee when the shadows lengthen,
and there is but a little way to go.

This is a wholly admirable book both for the purposes of private devotion and of public prayer.

Dr. David R. Mace, formerly Secretary of the National Marriage Guidance Council, in a book called *Whom God Hath Joined* (Epworth Press; 6s. net), writes with the purpose of adding to what may be said shortly and clearly with whatever

scientific or diagrammatic detail is thought desirable about the 'facts of life,' the specifically Christian and Biblical teaching about marriage as a personal enterprise involving intimacies and loyalties that are rooted in a religious attitude to life and duty. The result is a wise and practical short course of religious and largely Scriptural teaching about the objects aimed at and standards demanded in married life and the personal and social ideals that should inspire it.

In regard to *Bible Cavalcade*, by Mr. H. F. Mathews, M.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net), we find ourselves halting between two opinions. In eleven chapters, taking up a hundred and seventy-six pages, Mr. Mathews tells the whole story of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation. It is a deliberate attempt 'to see the Bible whole.' Too often we study the Bible in little sections, meticulously examining every word and the inevitable result is that often we cannot see the wood for the trees. It is just that situation that this book sets out to remedy. Why then the hesitation? We ourselves were quite unable to lay the book down. It swept us on and on in the tide of its narrative—but, that was the case only *because we knew the narrative already*. There is no better book than this for a person who knows his Bible reasonably well already. But it would not do for the man who does not know the Bible. Take this sentence about Moses. 'The well-intentioned accident in which his strength proved greater than he thought is just the kind of thing that would make any man flee the country.' There is a good deal of that kind of thing in the book. For the man who can mentally fill in the details all is well, but for the man who cannot it will only tantalize. But it may well be that that is another merit, for it may tantalize the man into reading the Bible itself. Mr. Mathews is completely abreast of modern scholarship. He himself can say things. 'Jesus was "The Man who broke history in two."' We do not know that it is quite fair to rank Elijah among 'the quaint dervishes.' The book is made doubly valuable by half a dozen pages of excellent chronological tables, maps, and suggestions for further reading.

Nine sermons by the Rev. David N. Francis have been published by the Epworth Press (5s. net). About the title—*No Risk—No Fun!*—there may well be two opinions. But not about the sermons. They are good—persuasive and challenging, and they deal with the questions people are asking—Do You Believe in Miracles?, Can We Believe the Bible?, Why a Harvest Festival?, What Do Ye More? (Remembrance Sunday). The talk on the vexed question of Sunday Observance is given (shortened) in 'The Christian Year' for the Fifth Sunday after Trinity.

Christians who are concerned about the impact of the Church on society will find much of interest in the essays collected and published under the title *Church and Society*, by the Rev. Maldwyn Edwards (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net). The first essay deals with the issue between Catholics and Protestants which holds up reunion movements, while the third deals historically with the Church and Socialism, and stresses the debt of the British Labour Movement to Nonconformity and especially to Methodism. The author is well equipped on the historical side; but he is also interesting and well-informed on such topics as 'The Holy Spirit in the World' and 'The Child and His Environment.'

Mr. H. Bisseker, M.A., formerly Headmaster of Leys School, Cambridge, has written a small book on weighty subjects—*Problems of Discipleship* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). He writes out of a wide experience of dealing with the moral and spiritual difficulties of young people and his treatment of their problems, which perplex also many not so young, is excellent. His subjects include temptation, the besetting sin, the sense of unreality in prayer, the forgiveness of wilful sin, the problem of suffering, feeling in the religious life, the true tests of a religious life, the value of sermons. In every chapter the reader will find help and light.

In a small book, *This Is the Will of God* (Epworth Press; 5s. net), Mr. John H. J. Barker, M.Sc., gives 'A Study of the Doctrine of Entire Sanctification as a Definite Experience.' He has diligently searched out what Scripture has to say about holiness. He knows the perplexity caused in many minds by the very word 'perfection,' and is careful to show what it does not mean. It is a stimulating book which will be a real help and a spur to many.

The fact that a second edition of *Psychology for Ministers and Social Workers*, by the Rev. H. Guntrip, B.A., B.D. (Independent Press; 12s. 6d. net), has been required so soon is in itself guarantee of the usefulness of this book. The second edition is not merely a reprint of the first; it has two new sections and two new whole chapters. The necessity of such a book is laid down in Mr. Guntrip's wise words: 'The day has long gone by

when it could be said that the doctor deals with the body and the pastor with the soul. The pastor who has eyes to see will often recognize in some forms of illness the symptoms of spiritual disharmony, and the doctor who knows that his patient is not a " case " but a " person " will often realize that " the person " would lose his tendency to illness if life were more satisfactory to him.' The magnitude of the problem may be seen from the fact that medical opinion estimates that ' anxiety gives rise to more than one-third of all illness.' A little knowledge and understanding will often show us that the troublesome man ' is not just a nuisance ; he is a man with a problem who needs to be understood.' Every one who deals with people needs to understand people, and this book will help him to understand them and to understand himself. Every one who deals with people must be consumed with a desire to help them, and this book will enable him to render a more effective ministry of help.

Is there room for another book on the first verses of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians ? Yes, if it is as good as *A More Excellent Way* (Independent Press ; 7s. 6d. net), by the Minister of Carr's Lane Congregational Church, Birmingham, the Rev. Leslie J. Tizard, B.A., B.D., B.Litt. To appreciate the quality of this reverent and thoughtful study, see p. 282 of this issue, where we have quoted—in shortened form—what Mr. Tizard says on ' Love . . . seeketh not her own.'

The Climax of the Ages, by Dr. Frederick A. Tatford (Marshall, Morgan, and Scott ; 15s. net), has as its sub-title ' Studies in the Book of Daniel.' Dr. Tatford is quite sure that the Book of Daniel was ' penned at least six centuries B.C.' by Daniel himself. ' For the Christian, the matter is finally disposed of by our Lord Himself, since He directly attributed the authorship of the Book to " Daniel the prophet." To the believer this is final and conclusive.' Dr. Tatford adopts the ' futurist ' interpretation of Daniel, the most important feature of which is said to be ' the placing of the present dispensation as a parenthesis between the sixty-ninth and seventieth " weeks " of Dan 9. From this follows the corollary that Daniel's prophecies regarding the " end-time " relate to the period subsequent to the removal of the Church from the world at the Second Coming of our Lord.' It is all very mysterious to the uninitiated.

God's Workmanship, by Mr. Oswald Chambers (Marshall, Morgan and Scott ; 7s. 6d. net), is a volume of forty-nine sermon studies. The sermons are strictly orthodox, but, on the whole, rather dull. That is not to say that there is not good material here. Here is the outline of the sermon on *Righteousness*. 1. Righteousness *of* God (Ps 71^{16}). This is to be seen (*a*) In creation (Gn 1^{31}). (*b*) In history (Is 40^{12-17}). (*c*) In providence (Ps 23^{3}). 2. Righteousness *before* God. This is to be found (*a*) in Christ (1 Co 1^{30}). (*b*) In consecration (Jn 15^{10}). (*c*) In communion (Ph 3^{9}).

The late Father Andrew was in great demand for conducting retreats. A selection of his addresses now appears—*The Romance of Redemption and Other Retreat Addresses* (Mowbray ; 5s. net). The book supplements a predecessor, ' In the Silence ' [1947]. After a brief talk on the ' soul's voyage ' we get ' The Romance of Redemption,' ' St. John's Gospel,' ' The Epistle to the Galatians.' There is much that is well and impressively said.

God's Word our Guide, compiled by Mr. H. T. Salzer, S.Th. (published for the British Council of Churches by the Religious Education Press ; 9d.), consists of Twenty Services for Schools on The Bible Speaks To-day. It has four sections : God's Approach to Man, Man's Response to God, Good News—the Saviour of the World and the Hope of Glory. The lay-out of the Services varies but there is always a hymn, a Scripture passage and prayers. Many of the great prayers of the Church are most appropriately used. This is an excellent and a most helpful little book. Our only fear is that since it is a paper-covered book it may be passed over. It is true that the price brings it within reach of every one, but this is so good a book of its kind that it deserved a better form. We highly commend it to all who have to conduct worship with young people.

The late Father Edward Keble Talbot was one of those rich and rare personalities to meet whom was definitely a spiritual uplift. He excelled in addressing ' retreats.' His words were taken down by devoted disciples skilled in stenography, and a selection of his talks is now published—*Retreat Addresses of Edward Keble Talbot* (S.P.C.K. ; 15s. net). The book is edited by Lucy Menzies, who writes an Introduction which itself is a literary and spiritual gem. The subjects include ' Let the heart of them rejoice that seek the Lord,' ' For ought else I care not,' ' Worship,' ' On being with God,' ' The Easter Message,' ' Other-worldliness,' ' Praise,' ' All Saints' Day,' ' On Death.' The whole is the revelation of a soul ' far ben,' as we say in Scotland, devoted to his Master, wise in counsel. It is certainly a book to recommend and to cherish.

Religious Education

Religious Broadcasting to Schools

By the Reverend Robert C. Walton, The British Broadcasting Corporation

Broadcasting to schools began as an experiment some twenty-eight years ago. Now in term time the B.B.C. offers some fifty different series of programmes designed for children at each stage of their development, from five-year-olds in Nursery Schools to boys and girls in the final years of their life in Secondary Grammar Schools. The majority of the broadcasts are for the United Kingdom as a whole, but they include eight series for schools in Wales and six for schools in Scotland. English Literature and History, Music and Science, Geography and Nature Study, Art Appreciation and Careers, Modern Languages, Current Affairs, and Religion—these are the main subjects of the weekly programmes which supplement and assist the work of teachers. Altogether 25,790 schools, sixty-seven per cent. of all the schools in the United Kingdom, use these broadcasts.

This work is planned and executed by a department of the B.B.C., but the broad lines of policy are directed by a body of educationalists—including teachers, lecturers in Training Colleges, H.M. Inspectors—who, with a staff provided by the Corporation, make up the School Broadcasting Council. There are also separate School Broadcasting Councils for Scotland and for Wales which provide the additional series of programmes which take account of the different educational situations and of the history and culture of their own nations.

Religious education is given its proper place in School Broadcasting. Stories from the Bible and from the lives of the saints, and incidents from Christian history are often used in literary and historical programmes. In addition there are two specifically religious series—a Service for Schools, and a Sixth Form series—*Religion and Philosophy*.

The Service which is planned for Secondary Modern Schools and the Junior Secondary Schools of Scotland—though many Primary teachers choose to let their older children participate in it—is broadcast on Friday mornings from 9.5 a.m. to 9.25 a.m. in the Home Service and is repeated on Tuesdays at 9.35 a.m. It is an act of worship designed to help children to offer praise and thanksgiving to God and to pray for themselves and for others. It has a very large audience, not only because a great many schools find it helpful, but also because normally the whole school and not only one class takes part in it. Assembled in the school hall—thirty children in a small village school or five hundred in an overcrowded city school—they join in the singing of the hymns and in prayers led by the minister in the studio. They listen to an interlude—a short story from the Gospels, the Old Testament, or from Christian biography—which is usually, though not invariably, presented in a dramatized form and performed by professional actors. Great care is taken to make the Service a unity—the hymns, prayers, and interlude each reflecting and illuminating one theme and creating an atmosphere in which a child may make his own response in worship. Adults who ' eavesdrop ' on the Service, especially those who through long study of the Bible have realized it imaginatively for themselves, sometimes dislike the dramatization of the life of Christ. Such an attitude is understandable, but it is not the child's reaction. For him, the courage and gentleness, the steadfast obedience, and the sacrifice of Christ become real as the familiar voices speak the words and portray the actions of priests and soldiers, blind men and cripples, disciples, and, above all, of our Lord Himself.

Religion and Philosophy is a very different kind of programme. It is not an act of worship but an intellectual presentation of the Christian religion to boys and girls who have received a Grammar School or Senior Secondary School education and will shortly be leaving to become nurses or engineers, to do their military service, or to study at a Training College or University. Their needs vary greatly. Some have already committed themselves to the Christian faith though their knowledge of it is small; others are indifferent or actively sceptical; many, encouraged by their schools to be intellectually curious, are questioning all traditions, not least that of religion. It is not the broadcaster in a studio, but the teacher, the minister, the parent who can know these boys and girls as individuals and be a wise friend and guide to them, but a series such as *Religion and Philosophy* has none the less a contribution to make. It can provide material based on sound Biblical scholarship to challenge the minds of Sixth Formers, to increase the range of their understanding and to whet still further their intellectual curiosity. It can bring to the microphone distinguished scientists, historians, theologians, and Christian men of action to share their knowledge and experience with boys and girls. On occasion, by using radio as an art form,

it can illuminate a particular problem or a particular Christian insight, or bring to life a crucial event in Christian history.

Religion and Philosophy is broadcast on Tuesdays in the Home Service from 11.40 to 12 noon. It is usual to devote the Autumn and Spring terms to the exposition of a great Christian doctrine. For example, in 1954–55 the subject during the Autumn term will be the Problem of Suffering and the Providence of God, and this will be followed in the Spring term by a series on the Problem of Evil and the Doctrine of Redemption. In the Summer term when schools are not always able to listen continuously there will be short units on Biblical Archaeology and on the plays of T. S. Eliot, and a distinguished scholar will be asked to give three talks on his own subject.

School Broadcasting is now an accepted part of the educational system of the United Kingdom, and the general pattern of its programmes is fixed. There is, however, still opportunity to try out new types of broadcasts and new series. In 1955, for instance, an experimental series in religious education for Secondary Modern Schools in England and Wales will be presented under the title *The Bible and Life*. Five programmes will deal with the making of the Gospels and five with stories from the Old and New Testaments, which raise ethical problems. Throughout the whole field of broadcasting to schools there exists the desire to experiment and to find more effective ways of supplementing and assisting the work of teachers. Broadcasting can never be a substitute for the knowledge, influence, and sympathetic understanding of the teacher working in the class-room, but it has its own contribution to make in the stimulating of the child's imagination and the enriching of his experience.

Is Q an Aramaic Document?

By the Reverend Frederick Bussby, M.B.E., B.D., M.Litt., Holy Trinity Vicarage, Bournemouth

Professor T. W. Manson has written: 'The only case in which we can feel fairly confident that a written Aramaic source lies behind the Gospels is that of the document Q.'[1] It is the purpose of the present article to marshall some evidence which, in the opinion of the writer, substantiates the confidence of Professor Manson's claim.

First of all, in view of the uncertainty of the exact limits of Q, it is necessary to define them before proceeding to study points in detail. The passages taken to belong to Q are those attributed to it by Streeter.[2] The Lucan passages are given and the Matthæan parallels assumed. They are Lk 3^{2-9} 3^{16-17} 3^{21-22} 4^{1-16a} 6^{20-49} 7^{1-10} 7^{18-35} 9^{57-60} 10^{2-16} 10^{21-24} 11^{8-52} 12^{2a-12} 12^{22-59} 13^{18-35} 14^{26-27} 14^{34-35} 16^{13} 16^{16-18} 17^{1-6} 17^{20-37} 19^{11-27}.

The Poetry of Q. The most obviously Semitic thing about Q is its Semitic verse. It is written mainly in that parallelism which we find in large portions of the Old Testament and in such works as the Odes of Solomon.[3] Klausner believed that Jesus 'had no acquaintance beyond the Hebrew and Aramaic literature created in Palestine.'[4] This certainly seems to be the case when we examine the form of Q. We have all the types of parallelism which Burney has brought to our attention[5] a century after it had been forgotten that Jebb had pointed out the same characteristics as long ago as 1820.[6] They are:

Synonymous parallelism: 6^{27-29} 6^{35} 6^{40} 11^{9-10} 11^{23} 11^{47} 12^{22-23} 12^{46} 16^{16}.
Antithetic parallelism: 12^{33} 12^{51}.
קל וחמר (*a minori ad maius*): 6^{41-2} 11^{13}.
Synthetic parallelism: 12^{49-50}.
Climactic parallelism: 6^{34} 10^{46} 11^{29} 12^{5}.
Compound parallelism: 10^{13-15} 11^{30-32} 12^{24-27} 13^{18-20} 17^{26-30}.
Kinah: 13^{34-35}.
Three beat rhythm: 10^{21-22} 11^{34-35}.
Assonance: 6^{27-36} 6^{40} 7^{8} 7^{32} 12^{7} 12^{34}.

That we find so essentially a Semitic characteristic so largely in Q makes it extremely improbable that it is purely a Greek product. Either there is an originally Semitic document which is the base of the present document, or else the Greek writer is rendering direct a Semitic oral tradition.

Transliterations in Q. When we pass from the general atmosphere to a critical examination of the text, we find we have a 'historical luxury we have no right to expect.'[7] This luxury takes the form of eight Aramaic words transliterated

[1] The Expository Times, xlvii. 10.
[2] *The Four Gospels*, 291.
[3] J. Rendel Harris and A. Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, 2 vols.
[4] *From Jesus to Paul*, 583.
[5] *The Poetry of our Lord.*
[6] The Expository Times, lx. 193.
[7] F. C. Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, 23.

for us and handed down to us in a thinly covering Greek guise. They are: Amen, Beelzebul, Gehenna, Mammon, Pharisees, Satan, Saton, and Sukaminos. In a previous issue of this magazine we have given reasons for holding to an Aramaic origin for Satan.[1] An examination of the other words gives strong support for an Aramaic origin.

Beelzebul. The first element of this word is the Aramaic בעיל, a form of the Hebrew בעל.[2] The second element varies between 'zebub' and 'zebul.' Jerome wrote: 'In fine ergo nominis b litera legenda est, non l; musca enim *zebub* vocatur.'[3] The Aramaic variation from 'b' to 'l' could easily be of malicious intent to cast still further dishonour upon the 'God of dung.' Or, if we may take a hint from the Ras Shamra tablets, Zebul, Lord of the Earth is another name for Baal, God of rain.[4]

Gehenna. The precise New Testament form of this name appears nowhere else in Greek literature before the writing of the Gospels. In the LXX it appears variously as *φάραγξ Ὀνόμ, Ἐννόμ, Γαι Ὀννόμ.*[5] These renderings are a close following of the original Hebrew. In Jos 18[16] the LXX reads *Γαίεννα* and it is from this that Deissmann thinks the New Testament form derives.[6] Abbott-Smith suggests that the form is rather handed down through the Aramaic.[7]

Mammon. As in the case of Gehenna, so in the case of Mammon, there is no known surviving example of the Greek form of this word (*μαμωνᾶς*) before the writing of the Gospels. When the translator of Ecclesiasticus met it in Hebrew he rendered it by *χρυσίου.* The Hebrew form occurs also in the Zadokite fragments[8] and in Pirke Aboth.[9] Jerome and Augustine both believed that the word had a Semitic origin. Jerome wrote: Nam gentili Syrorum lingua Mammon divitiae nuncupantur.[10] Augustine tells us that it is the Punic for 'lucrum.'[11] This Semitic origin is supported by modern scholarship. Professor G. R. Driver, in a letter to the writer, says that the word is ultimately derived from the Accadian Mimma and Memmeni, 'anything,' whence Mimmu meaning property. The Hebrew form of the word is ממון, the Greek form *μαμωνᾶς.* In view of the origin of the word it could well have existed in Aramaic from which the existing Greek rendering derives. The ending—*ας*—is the same as in *Σατανᾶς.* Had the Greek transliterated straight from the Hebrew we might have expected rather *μαμων,* just as the LXX rendered שָׂטָן by *σατάν.*

Pharisees. This is yet another word which we cannot find in pre-Christian Greek. Dalman thinks its origin is פרישיא.[12] Zahn likewise holds its origin to be פרישיא.[13] Both agree on the Aramaic origin of the word. Indeed Zahn goes further and states that the form arose among the Jews of Palestine *c.* 150–130 B.C.,[14] and that from the beginning the name was Aramaic. Was it possibly Galilean Aramaic in origin? Odeberg writes: 'Another characteristic feature of Galilean Aramaic is the preservation of the diphthongs, especially "ai."'[15]

Saton. In the earlier Hebrew books of the Old Testament the underlying Hebrew is translated by *μέτρον* in the LXX.[16] In the later books and in Aquila and Symmachus we have *σατόν.* Aramaic influence could well account for this change as the Hebrew סאה appears as סאהא in Aramaic. Indeed Jerome says: Satum genus est mesurae iuxta morem Palestinae provinciae.[17]

Sukaminos. The passage in which this occurs (Lk 17[6]) is the only place in the New Testament where the 'sycamine tree' is mentioned. In the LXX it is used to translate the Hebrew שִׁקְמָה. Manson believes that the present instance of *συκάμινος* (mulberry tree) is a mistranslation in Q of the Aramaic שקמה due to Q's almost too faithful copying of his source.[18]

Place names in Q. The Semitic basis certainly, and the Aramaic basis possibly, of Q begins to emerge. Further enquiry shows more evidence to support the claims for an Aramaic basis. Harnack pointed out long ago that the geographical horizon of Q is bounded by Galilee. We may observe that those names which refer to places outside Galilee are such as would be known by any reader or hearer of the Scriptures: Nineveh,

[1] THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxi. 159.

[2] M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim,* etc., s.v. בעיל.

[3] E. Nestle in *D.C.G.*, i. 181.

[4] J. Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past,* 147.

[5] R. H. Charles in *H.D.B.*, ii. 119.

[6] *Light from the Ancient East,* 259, n. 7.

[7] *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, s.v.*

[8] R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,* ii. 832.

[9] ii. 12. The word occurs in a saying of Rabbi Jose dated by R. Travers Herford (*Pirke Aboth,* 66), *c.* A.D. 80.

[10] *Epistle,* xxii. 31 (Migne, *P.L.*, xxii. col. 417); cf. *Ep.*, cxxi. Non Hebraeorum sed Syrorum lingua (Migne, *ib.* col. 1019).

[11] Augustine, *Sermon,* lxiii. (on Lk 16).

[12] *The Words of Jesus,* 2.

[13] *Introduction to the New Testament,* i. 32.

[14] *Ib.*

[15] *The Aramaic Portions of Bereshit Rabba* [Lund, 1939], ii. 155.

[16] Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint, s.v. μέτρον.*

[17] Commentary on Mt 13[33].

[18] *The Mission and Message of Jesus,* 433.

Sidon, Sodom, Tyre, Israel, Jordan, and Jerusalem. But even his rendering of Jerusalem has an Aramaic turn. Instead of giving the transliteration current in the pagan world, he employs a more traditional form which Masterman[1] thinks goes back to the usage of Jesus Himself, a view supported by Plummer[2] and McNeile.[3] The one place-name to which Q is the first known writer to introduce us, is Chorazin. Jerome[4] tells us that it was situated two miles from Capernaum, while the Talmud tells us it was famous for its wheat.[5] Recent archaeology has confirmed the existence of the place, and the inscription found in the synagogue there includes 'Moses' seat,' the Aramaic קתדרא דמשא.[6] Other place-names mentioned by him are Bethsaida, Capernaum, and possibly Nazareth.

All these places are within Galilee, even allowing for the difficulty felt over the location of Bethsaida. From Mk 6[45] it would appear that Bethsaida is on the east side of the Lake of Galilee while in Jn 12[21] we learn that Philip came from Bethsaida *in* Galilee. This supposed discrepancy Klausner attributes to an error on the part of the writer of the Fourth Gospel.[7] Another suggests that there were two places of the same name.[8] But if we follow Josephus it is entirely reasonable to suppose that Galilee included territory east of Jordan. Speaking of the eastern border of Galilee he says that it included 'the territory of Hippos, Gadara, and Gaulanitis, the frontier of Agrippa's kingdom.'[9] Thus Bethsaida could be, from Q's point of view, part of Galilee.

As with Chorazin, so with Capernaum and Nazareth, Q is possibly the first known writer to introduce the names to us.

Personal Names in Q. With one exception, all Q's personal names are Semitic: John, Jesus, Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Noah, Solomon, and Zachariah. The one exception is 'Baptist.' This suggests that it is a nickname given originally in contempt but accepted (cf. Methodists) with pride. Moulton and Milligan give no use of it in the papyri nor do the recent editors of Liddell and Scott give any example outside the Gospels and Josephus.

Translations and Mistranslations in Q. The fact that Q is preserved for us in two books prompts the question as to the divergencies which we find. Frequently we have a passage handed down in almost identical words with the exception of a single word or phrase. The difference is clearly due neither to a slight flaw in the Greek tradition nor to any paraphrase. The meaning is quite different. Some examples are given.

Lk 3[16]. 'I am not worthy to unloose': *οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι.* Mt 3[11]. 'I am not worthy to bear': *οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς βαστάσαι.*

Manson[10] has suggested that a single Aramaic word may underlie 'unloose' and 'bear.' Torrey[11] gives this as שקל which means not only to carry, but also to take off, *e.g.*, a coat.

Lk 6[22]. 'Cast out your name as evil': *ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν.* Mt 5[11]. 'Say all manner of evil': *εἴπωσιν πᾶν πονηρόν.*

Wellhausen maintains that the same Aramaic could well be translated in the two ways offered by Luke and Matthew.[12]

Lk 6[23]. 'Their fathers': *οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.* Mt 5[12]. 'Which were before you': *τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.*

Whilst the one could be a paraphrase of the other it is worth recalling that a slight variation of reading would give these renderings: קדמיהון, 'their fathers'; דקדמיכון '(which) were before you.'

Lk 10[5]. 'Peace be to this house': *εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ.* Mt 10[12]. 'Salute it': *ἀσπάσασθε αὐτήν.*

Luke alone among New Testament writers uses *εἰρήνη* to signify absence from war. Normally, and here, it is a rendering of the Oriental greeting. In McLachlan's[13] view it is the Aramaic form which underlies the present text. McNeile,[14] commenting on the passage in Matthew, holds that the variations come from the same Aramaic original.

Lk 11[41]. 'Give for alms': *δότε ἐλεημοσύνην.* Mt 23[26]. 'Cleanse': *καθάρισον.*

Wellhausen was the first to suggest that the original Aramaic דכי was rightly taken by Matthew to mean 'cleanse,' and that Luke misread the original as זכי and therefore translated, 'give alms.' Burney varies this by saying that the original זכן could easily have both meanings. In his view Jesus said דבניא זכן: 'that which is within, purify.'[15] Recent scholars have not dissented from this. Professor Black[16] holds

[1] *D.C.G.*, i. 849.

[2] *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 324, n. 1.

[3] *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 341; cf. Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ii. 147. Mark always writes *Ἱεροσόλυμα*; but Q writes *Ἱερουσαλήμ*.

[4] *Onomasticon*, 174. [5] *Menahoth*, 85a.

[6] Sukenik, *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece*, 21.

[7] *Jesus of Nazareth*, 165. [8] *D.C.G.*, i. 198.

[9] *Wars of the Jews*, iii. 35.

[10] *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 332.

[11] *The Four Gospels*, 290.

[12] McNeile, *St. Matthew*, 53; Manson, *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 340.

[13] *St. Luke: The Man and His Work*, 54 (based on Nestle and Wellhausen).

[14] *St. Matthew*, 137.

[15] C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 9.

[16] *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 2.

that the original suggestion has survived criticism: Dr. Kilpatrick thinks the variations are explicable by independent recourse on the part of Luke and Matthew to the original Aramaic, though in the case of Matthew it occurs in the source M.[1]

Lk 11[42]. 'mint and rue and every herb': *τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ πήγανον καὶ πᾶν λάχανον.* Mt 23[23]. 'mint and anise and cummin': *τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον.*

This variant is the one that convinced Nestle[2] that 'one of the sources used by Luke was Semitic . . . without a possibility of contradiction.' The Aramaic for rue is שִׁבְרָא: the Aramaic for anise is שִׁבְתָּא.

Lk 14[26]. 'Cannot be my disciple': *οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής.* Mt 10[37]. 'Is not worthy of me': *οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.*

Jesus was so fundamentally opposed to the whole scribal system that Manson believes He would have refrained from using the words normally associated with it. Rather than use such a word as תַּלְמִיד He would use, as a carpenter, the term for apprentice שְׁוּלְיָי.[3] It is this word which is misunderstood by Matthew and translated as though it were שְׁוִי לִי, worthy of me.

Lk 16[16]. 'Is preached': *εὐαγγελίζεται.* Mt 11[12]. 'Suffereth violence': *βιάζεται*

These widely differing words can best be explained by recourse to the Aramaic. The word אִתְּפְּרַס means 'is preached.' This could easily be mis-heard as אִתְּפְּרַז, 'suffereth violence.' This change from ס to ז, as in עלס and עלז, is readily explicable on philological grounds.[4]

Finally there are three passages where there is no difference in the Greek version but which are, as they stand, not as clear as we should wish. If there is an Aramaic original, a fuller meaning is restored.

Lk 7[8] and Mt 8[9]. 'Under authority': *ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν.*

This sentiment, in its context, is most surprising. The statement we expect from the centurion is that he is himself a man in authority. This readily appears if, with Manson,[5] we restore the original Aramaic תְּחוֹת which means not only 'under' but also 'in place of.' The centurion was himself a representative of authority.

Lk 7[34] and Mt 11[19]. 'Son of man': *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.*

In Galilean Aramaic the phrase גַּבְרָא דָּהוּא is used as a substitute for 'I.' Manson[6] goes further and suggests that the Aramaic בַּר נָשׁ was used in the same way. If so, a perfect parallelism is restored:

There came John neither eating nor drinking,
Then came Myself both eating and drinking.

Lk 12[46] and Mt 24[51]. 'Cut him asunder': *διχοτομήσει.*

Although the rendering is the same in both versions, a literal understanding of it (and we must beware of being too literal in dealing with Oriental documents) makes no sense. A slave so punished is incapable of further punishment. Indeed the word is not used, so far as is known, of punishment. Badcock,[7] however, suggests that we can find a solution in the Aramaic which he then renders:

'he shall divide to him his portion with.'

A Semitic source for part of Q at any rate is inescapable. The evidence mounts up that that Semitic source was handed down in Aramaic rather than in any other Semitic language. Hebrew was no longer a spoken language in everyday life. The likelihood of this is further strengthened when we recall Peter's homely Galilean dialect,[8] and when we add to that our certain knowledge that in Galilee there was considerable carelessness in using, and confusion between, similar Aramaic words even though their meanings were widely separate. The latest scholar to refer to this is Odeberg in his *The Aramaic Portions of the Bereshit Rabbah.*[9] The confusion was long ago noted in the Talmud.[10] A certain Galilean said אמר למאן אמר למאן. They answered him, O foolish Galilean: חמר למירכב עמר למילבש: חמר למיישת: אימר לאיתכסאה The sense is When the Galilean asked אמר למאן, whose is אמר Immar, 'this lamb,' he pronounced the first letter in the word Immar so confusedly and uncertainly, that the hearers knew not whether he meant חמר Chamar, that is an ass; or חמר Chamar, wine; or עמר 'Amr wool; or אימר Immar, 'a lamb.' Lightfoot,[11] in his *Horae Hebraicae,* gives further illustrations. If the characteristic is as marked as this testimony suggests, then the confusion in the tradition as preserved in Luke and Matthew gains in probability.

[1] *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew,* 30 f.

[2] The Expository Times, xv. 528.

[3] *The Teaching of Jesus,* 237.

[4] W. Wright, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages,* 58.

[5] *The Mission and Message of Jesus,* 356 f.; M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts,* 116.

[6] *The Teaching of Jesus,* 217.

[7] In *The Church Quarterly Review,* cxxii. 197.

[8] Mt 26[73]. Jerome comments: Non quod alterius sermonis esset Petrus, aut gentis aut terrae: (omnes quippe Hebraei erant et qui arguebant et qui arguebatur) sed quod unaquaque provincia et regio, habebat proprietates suas et vernaculum loquendi sonum non vitare possit.

[9] Vol. 2.

[10] Erubhin 53b.

[11] Vol. i. 171 [Editor, R. Gandell, Oxford, 1859].

The Christian Hope and the Problem of Demythologizing—*continued*[1]

By Professor Rudolf Bultmann, D.D., Zürich

Translated from the German by the Reverend Conrad Bonifazi, M.A., Malvern

The Demythologizing that has taken place in History

Actually, the demythologizing of primitive Christian mythology is by no means a new thing in every respect. At an early stage the mythological picture of hope was demythologized in a certain way by being *sacramentalized*, that is, through the concept that the powers of the otherworldly, future life are already operative in the sacraments which the Church dispenses, and in the churchly institutions which guarantee their proper dispensation. Ancient liturgies show that the eschatological Parousia (Second Coming) of Christ was experienced proleptically in His cultic appearing (Epiphany). The disappointment at the deferment of the expected Advent of Christ was more easily overcome by this means that precisely in the sacrament one knew Him and the powers of the future as already present. The sacramental Church appears as God's Kingdom already present.

The Jewish picture of hope and its allied view of history have been demythologized in quite another way, in the sense that they have exchanged their religious for a secular connotation; they have been *secularized*. Didn't the problem of the meaning of history lie at the basis of that picture of history? A problem which did not disturb ancient Greece, but which has roused the West since Augustine, and especially modern men? And wasn't the idea of historical development fundamental to that view of history? The thought that the meaning of history is unveiled only in the course of its movement, indeed fundamentally, only in its end? The knowledge about the end of history, as the old mythology represented it, had certainly passed away, but so far as one intended knowing about the end of history, it was possible to understand again the whole course of history as a significant unity. This was so in the case of Hegel, for whom the goal of history was the coming-to-itself of the Spirit, and of Marx for whom its end was universal well-being through the achievement of the classless society. The picture of the development and goal of history portrayed by Hegel and Marx is the demythologized, secularized eschatology of primitive Christianity—as Karl Löwith, for example, has repeatedly shown.

But, of course, the question is whether demythologizing through secularization has really grasped the meaning contained in that ancient mythology. For, does it not express a religious understanding of human existence? And is this not perhaps more rightly and deeply apprehended in the 'Chiliastic Sonnets' of Karl Immermann in which the poet sets his vision of the future over against the socialistic utopia of St. Simon? Historical speculation is far removed from Immermann; out of the ancient hope he fastens only upon the figure of the awaited Messiah, who, for him, is the type of the natural—one might say—the human man who stands beyond all differentiations created by history and civilization, who is free of all miseducation and artificiality, even free of the commanding imperative of ethical demand, because he does the right of his own accord, by virtue of his natural being. The 'Chiliastic Sonnets' simulate faith that this man will come and that all will bow to his dominion. But this feigned belief only shows what the lost yet desired nature of man and of human society is, never realized as a condition in concrete history, but defining man and thereby releasing him from the actual present when he recognizes this picture as that of his own nature. In it the never-attainable future does occasionally become factually present. Here the old mythological picture of hope is not secularized but spiritualized.

Is it not *spiritualization* when Luther explains in the Short Catechism the second petition of the Lord's Prayer, 'Thy kingdom come': 'God's kingdom comes from God Himself without our praying; but we ask in this prayer that it may come to us too. How does that happen? Answer: When the heavenly Father gives us His Holy Spirit that through His grace we may believe His

[1] An article, by Professor Ian Henderson of Glasgow University, with the title 'A Christian Estimate of Karl Jaspers,' will appear next month. It will deal, *inter alia*, with the differences between Jaspers and Bultmann on the demythologizing issue. Then a second article by Professor Henderson, going further into this important controversy, will follow.—*Editor.*

Word and live a godly life, here in accordance with time and there eternally.' The petitioned and promised future Kingdom of God is here understood as being spiritually present at the same time. Nor is it otherwise in the explanation of the second petition in the Long Catechism where Luther expressly differentiates between the future revelation of God's Kingdom and its present efficacy 'through the Word and the power of the Holy Spirit.' In this sense, too, in the confessional writings, the Kingdom of Christ is understood as a spiritual Kingdom in which Christ 'rules through the Word and sermon, operates through the Holy Spirit increasing in us faith, fear of God, love, an inward patience in the heart, and begins in us here upon earth the Kingdom of God and eternal life.' In Pietism this understanding is taken up and enlarged in such a way that to Christian works of love and missionary activity is ascribed the task of building the Kingdom of God upon earth. If this spiritualization is an *ethicizing*, it is first properly so when Kant adopts the concept of the Kingdom of God in order to understand by it a Kingdom of moral ends. Then, under Kantian influence, nineteenth-century theology, above all in the case of Albrecht Ritschl, understood the Kingdom of God simultaneously as a gift and a task; as a task—so far as may be—of bringing progressively to dominance the will of God in human society, thus realizing the Kingdom of God within the world. Thus the prospect of a future consummation could more or less recede; and one may conjecture to what extent the thought of God's rule was spiritualized, and to what extent secularized, which was the case in varying degrees in Europe and America.

One could describe as a certain kind of spiritualization the *aestheticizing* of the ancient picture of hope through art, especially through the music of *Requiem* compositions. I do not wish to doubt that the deeper sense of mythological eschatology can be communicated to the hearer of the *Requiem* of Mozart or Bruckner, Verdi, or Brahms, without being brought to consciousness in clear definitions. But I do doubt whether there are many hearers who take seriously the '*Dies irae, dies illa*' as a prediction of things to come, seeing themselves as the wretch (miser) becoming dumb before the Divine Judge, and who do not enjoy it only æsthetically as the artistic presentation of the Divine Judgment. One might think of Count Yorck von Wartenburg's characterization of Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* in the Sixtine Chapel: 'A great moral, not religious poem lies before us. That which issues from the presentation of the Last Judgment is like the sensation of an earthquake.'

The question now is: *Is its original sense, its dominating concept of existence firmly maintained in the spiritualization of the mythological picture of hope?* Yes, in any case to a certain degree. A basic motive of the old hope is man's knowledge of the insufficiency of the Here and Now that can never grant him the fulfilment of his real life. There is at the same time this understanding of it, that his real nature transcends the world in which he now lives, over which he disposes as his sphere of labour, and in which his destiny lies—the knowledge that only a reality transcending this world of work and destiny can grant him his life's fulfilment. It is the knowledge that 'this world is not the only world' (Franz Werfel). A trace of this knowledge has remained in the secularized forms of hope in so far as the understanding of the insufficiency of the Here and Now is effective within them. But the belief that human planning and action can realize that time of fulfilment which lies beyond all history hitherto, abandons the decisive idea in the ancient hope that the fulfilment of human life cannot be the result of human effort but is rather a gift from beyond, the gift of God's grace—however naïvely mythological thinking may have depicted the event which brings God's saving grace, and however naïvely it represented the fulfilment of the hope as a situation which could be painted only in this-worldly colours. If one has recognized that in mythological presentation the other world is characteristically set in terms of this world and one foregoes this resolutely, then the actual intention of the mythological picture of hope is not difficult to recognize; but it becomes clear when finally the eye fastens upon that form of demythologizing which had its beginning in the New Testament itself.

The Demythologizing which takes place in the New Testament

While Jewish hope anticipates the end of the world and the beginning of the time of salvation as future, and popular belief in early Christianity maintains that this future is imminent and awaits the 'appearing' of Christ as constituting *the* turn of events, Paul is still convinced, without having abandoned this expectation, that the decisive event has *already happened*, that the turning-point of the ages has been reached—in the coming of Jesus of Nazareth: 'When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son' (Gal 4^4). Whoever believes in Him as God's grace which has been revealed, whoever—as Paul says—'is in Christ,' he is a new creature; 'old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new' (2 Co 5^{17}). Already, in the present, believers can conduct themselves in the power of life; for as

Adam once brought death to mankind, so Christ has opened up the possibility of life for all believers. While Paul held alongside this the hope of Christ's 'appearing' and the end of this world, John abandoned it and works out radically the thought of the presence of Life already brought by Jesus. For him the first advent of Christ signifies the judgment of the world, and this judgment is decisive: by our attitude to the Person of Jesus is decided who shall enter into life and who is doomed to death. 'He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already. . . . And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, . . . Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live' (Jn $3^{18\text{-}19}$ 5^{25}). 'For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind' (Jn 9^{39}).

Is this, too, a matter of spiritualization? In actual fact a legitimate interest of spiritualization finds expression here, namely this, that the experience of the grace of God is the fulfilment of the present time. And even then it is not simply a matter of spiritualizing (*Spiritualismus*) in which the characteristically dialectical relationship between present and future is misapprehended: namely, that the realization of the present means at the same time its definition by the future, that the God who is present is simultaneously the God who is coming. But this dialectic is expressed by Paul and John, each in his own way: by Paul who, in spite of the word 'old things are passed away; behold all things are become new,' still clings to the old mythological picture of the future; by John who holds to the Hellenistic-Gnostic hope of souls ascending into the world of light. To be sure, according to Paul and John man is set free in this present time to enter into life through faith in God's grace revealed in Jesus. But he has this life not simply as a possession, any more than that his faith is a conviction possessed once for all but is rather an act of faith ever to be repeated. The present is not time which stands still for man; as a particular 'in between' it is determined either by the past or the future; either man is always dying with his perpetually vanishing past or living in virtue of his future. The God of the present moment is the God who is coming, and only because He is that, is He the God of the present whose grace releases man from servitude to his past for the future, for God's future.

With this insight, then, the sense and rightness of the mythological pictures are comprehended, in so far as these promise the individual victory over death—whether it be the Jewish picture which speaks about the resurrection of the dead, or the Gnostic which promises the ascent of the soul into the world of light. The one certainty of our human future is that for every man death is coming. For him who is open to all that is future as the future of the coming God, death has lost its terror. He will refrain from painting in the future which God bestows in death, for all pictures of a glory after death can only be the wishful images of imagination, and to forego all wishful images is part of the radical openness of faith in God's future. But the sense of the mythological pictures of hope laid bare through demythologizing is this that they speak about God's future as of the realization of human life.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Street of Difficulties

By the Reverend A. N. Mackean, B.D.,
Port of Spain, Trinidad

'He stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.'
—Lk 9^{51}.

I had never been in Lisbon or Madeira before, and one of the things you must do on leaving a ship for the day ashore is to know how to find your way back. It is very easy to get lost in a strange city, and if you don't know the language of the country, how can you ask the way? So, as I went along, I carefully noted the names of the streets through which I passed. And what lovely and colourful names they had—the Street of the Basketmakers, the Street of the Fishermen, the Street of the Silversmiths, the Street of the Wine-sellers, and so on. Others had names with a distinctively religious flavour—like the Street of the Holy Spirit, the Street of the Blessed Trinity, the Street of the Infant Jesus, and many others like these; names which, I felt, would confer dignity even upon a row of slums. And surely it must be a help to anyone to grow up in the Street of the Grace of Jesus Christ. We ought all to grow up in that. How dull and commonplace seemed the names of our own streets in comparison.

But it was in Madeira that I found my imagination caught by the name of one street I passed. 'Rua dos Difficuldades' it was called—The Street of Difficulties! How well the name suited it—a narrow cobbled street winding its tortuous way steeply upwards into the mountains that lie

behind Funchal. Where it ended I do not know; but, I thought, it ought to end if not in, at least in sight of, the Celestial City.

You do not need to go abroad, however, to find this street. It is one we come across wherever we live. Again and again as we go through life, we come upon it. And it is a street that we don't want to go up, far less stay in. We try to get round the mountain by an easier way.

Do you remember how in *The Pilgrim's Progress* Bunyan tells us that at the foot of the Hill Difficulty there were three roads—one which was narrow and ran up the side of the hill, while the other two were broad and easy and seemed to skirt the mountain? The name of one was Danger, and the name of the other Destruction.

Many people, when they come to the Street of Difficulties, lose their nerve and look for some way of avoiding it. They try to find some easy way out of the jam they are in—by telling lies, by cheating, by slipping out of their obligations, by forgetting their promise. They take the broad, easy-looking ways that Bunyan warns us against; ways which endanger character.

At school and at work you will come upon the Street of Difficulties many a time. Don't try to evade it. Go up it! And you will find that the view from the top is glorious, that it has all been worth the effort.

In the passage from which I have taken the text, we read how Jesus went up this same street. He knew it would lead Him through misunderstanding, hostility, and injustice to the Cross, and His disciples tried to dissuade Him. They would have held Him back, but 'he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.' Where He led, we who are His disciples must go too.

Let the road be rough and dreary,
And its end far out of sight,
Foot it bravely; strong or weary,
Trust in God, and do the right.

The Rope

By the Reverend W. E. Booth Taylor,
St. Albans, Herts.

'Workers together . . .'—2 Co 6^{1}.

On one of the bitterly cold days in January a friend who had called to see me asked if I would like to borrow a book. I was glad to have it, for it was the story of *The Ascent of Everest*. When I looked at the photographs of the mighty Himalayan peaks, some of them covered in snow and ice, others kept bare in parts by the violent swirling winds, I felt thankful that the cold of an English winter was not like that.

I knew, of course, that those who climb mountains, even in Great Britain, usually make good use of a rope. Climbers are fastened to the rope in a special way; each, then, is able to help the other, and should one slip or lose his foothold, the others can save him from falling. It was a surprise to me to learn, however, that often the team itself, when fastened together for climbing, is called 'The Rope.' The strong rope that binds them makes them as one.

We all remember how Hillary and Tenzing finally stood on the top of Mount Everest, the world's highest mountain. But the book makes it clear again and again that Hillary and Tenzing only succeeded because of 'The Rope.' It might easily have been two other members of the team, but that would have made no difference. The victory was won because all worked together. Not only the climbers, but many others who helped with the preparations in this country, in India, and Nepal. All worked together cheerfully, willingly; some sacrificially, and co-operation brought success. This was no tug-of-war, but a splendid example of 'all pulling together.' Had some pulled one way, some another; had some members of the team insisted that their way was always right, and others that the whole team must do just as they wished, then Everest would never have been conquered.

So it is in many walks of life. I think we can say without any doubt that it is a happy home where mother and father, boys and girls, all pull together; where they live out the principle of 'The Rope,' so to speak. And in our Sunday school and church great things can be done if we all readily and cheerfully pull together.

The Apostle Paul once made a startling statement. The more we think about it the more startling it seems. Writing to his Christian friends in Corinth, he said: 'We then, as workers together with him.' What a wonderful thought that we are to be workers together with God. Yet that is exactly what our Christian discipleship is meant to be. And great as is the conquest of Everest, yet to work together under the leadership of our Master in the great service of the Gospel and the Kingdom, is the greatest and noblest adventure of all.

The Christian Year

Second Sunday after Trinity

The Snare of Worldliness

By the Reverend Stewart Mechie, M.A.,
Glasgow

'And they all with one consent began to make excuse. . . . And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.'—Lk $14^{18.\ 27}$.

In this passage we are confronted with two kinds of worldliness, a cruder and a more refined.

The Parable of the Great Supper was in the first instance directed against the well-to-do people who were about our Lord as He sat at table in the house of a leading Pharisee. As the meal proceeded one of the guests burst out sententiously, 'Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God.' In the circumstances the exclamation was not entirely inappropriate; but along with its pious sentiment there was also an undertone of complacency, as if the speaker intended to convey his assurance that when the banquet was spread in the Kingdom of God, he, at any rate, would be there. Doubtless it was that attitude of complacency which provoked our Lord to tell the story of the Great Supper, for its central point is the refusal of the bidden guests to attend when the due time has come.

The bidden guests are the Pharisees, seemingly devout Jews and zealous for godliness. The later guests, drawn from the streets and lanes of the city, represent Jews of the lower classes, religiously speaking. They are Jews, but from the Pharisaic point of view bad Jews. The final party of guests from the highways and hedges represents folks from beyond the borders of Judaism, the inhabitants of the Gentile world.

We may, however, neglect the wider application of the story and concentrate on its immediate bearing on the man who made the pious remark. Jesus does not challenge the sentiment of the speaker, but He does challenge his sincerity. He says in effect, 'Are you sure you will be there when the heavenly banquet is spread? You are right in thinking that you have been invited—you Pharisees clothed in your respectability and you rich men clothed in your grandeur. You have been bidden; but now that the time is at hand, now that the Kingdom of God as embodied in My mission has come near to you, you are showing every sign of refusing it. You talk enthusiastically about the Kingdom of God, but you have little real interest in it. The opportunity for which you profess to crave is before you, but you are too much taken up with this world to seize it. You reject Me because you have other and, as you think, more important business on hand. It is your wealth, your position and your reputation that you really value. Like the people in the story, your excuses are varied, but they all amount to the same thing in the end. You are pre-occupied. Your standards of value are earthly, not heavenly. Treasure on earth means more to you than treasure in heaven. The claims of mammon take precedence of the claims of God. Your distinguishing mark is not godliness, as you fondly imagine, but worldliness.'

Thus the story has something to say to us who are church members. Ere long we shall be eating bread at the Lord's Table as His bidden guests. How many of the hundreds of people who could then be present will not be present, and that for insufficient reasons? How many will have made excuse? Again, is it not possible that some of us, though we shall be present in body, will be absent, so far as spirit and intention are concerned, our minds and hearts being pre-occupied and too full of other things to seek to partake of the spiritual food which nourishes and imparts the life that is life indeed? Let us ponder on the implications of the solemn thought that it is the first bidden guests who in the end refuse the invitation.

Now let us pass on to the verses that are significantly placed after this parable. We read that there went great multitudes with Jesus. No wonder! Any teacher who was reputed to talk so very forthrightly to proud Pharisees would be sure to have a strong attraction for the multitudes. 'Here,' they would reflect, 'is a leader worthy to be followed. He rebukes the upholders of things as they are. He teaches that the invitation to the Kingdom of God includes common folk. When the heavenly banquet is spread we shall be there.' It is to people thinking such comfortable thoughts that our Lord addresses those staggering words about bearing the Cross and hating the nearest and dearest of friends. No doubt He was using the Hebrew idiom, and so was not asking that a man should literally hate his friends, but only that he should give them second place in his regard. The first place must be given to the Kingdom of God as embodied in Himself. Even so, however, the demand is overwhelming, for it is not only a man's friends who must take second place, it is himself also. He must bear his cross; he must hate his own life. That is far more than self-denial as we commonly understand it. People in Palestine were all too familiar with crosses. After every rebellion of the extreme Jewish nationalists the Romans were wont to line the roads with crucified captives. To bear the Cross, therefore, would signify to our Lord's hearers in the first place to accept martyrdom at the hands of Rome. What He intended to convey was that to become His disciple might mean for any man the risk of being reckoned an undutiful son, a bad husband and father, perhaps a dangerous revolutionary. He who wills to become the Lord's disciple must be so devoted that he will accept such a risk with open eyes, not simply in a burst of enthusiasm but as a deliberate choice to be continued to the end whatever the cost.

That is what our Lord demands. It is not the renunciation of this or that, but it is real self-denial. It is such a renunciation of the self that

into the most precious associations and fellowships that the human heart can know—the beloved country, the beloved family, the beloved self—He may come; and when He comes He will take first place. To deny Him that is worldliness. It is not the crude worldliness that is expressed in lust for wealth and place and power, but a more subtle worldliness that often takes on the guise of innocent, even commendable, affections. The Lord's demand is inflexible. With you, husband and wife, He must be first. With you, son and daughter, He must be first. With you, mother and father, He must be first. How difficult it is even to see what putting Him first involves, and how very difficult to do it once one has seen! With man, indeed, it is impossible, but not with God; for with God all things are possible. If His demand is inflexible, His succour is invincible.

Let this be a focus for our self-examination ere we go to the Holy Communion. Are we to be present in spirit and intention as well as in body? Are we putting the Lord first so far as He has caused us to know what that means? Are we willing to put Him first in anything further that He may reveal to us? Are we willing to bear the Cross? If we dare not say that we are, then are we willing to be made willing? When we can affirm that, then we have, by God's grace, escaped the snare of worldliness.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Adult Christianity

BY THE REVEREND T. R. MILFORD, M.A., CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF LINCOLN

'Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.'—Mt 18^{3} (R.V.).

'Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine.'—Eph $4^{13, 14}$ (R.V.).

These two texts are not really in opposition. When our Lord says that we must become as little children, and when He says that whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of heaven as a little child, shall not receive it at all, what does He mean? It is not that little children are always good and innocent; they aren't. It is not that they accept everything without questioning; they ask lots of questions. It is that they are dependent, and know it; they can receive, and ask for more; they wonder and admire; they want to have and grow and be. Everything is before them; they do not even think they have arrived. In the particular context of the gospel, the disciples had been discussing the endless boring question, which was the greatest, and He tells them that they are all in the infant class.

In the face of God and His universe, we are all in the infant class, and the beginning of wisdom is to realize it. It is the man who has closed his mind who is unteachable. It is the man who thinks he has got everything taped who needs to become as a little child before he can learn the first thing about God. God is always surprising, and often much too simple for clever people to understand. Pity the clever people who have a ready explanation for everything, and greet the unseen with a sneer.

The Christian saints are in a sense child-like to the end of their lives. They are fresh and eager, always ready to be surprised, always ready to receive, and never suppose they can do anything by themselves. Perhaps the opposite of what they are is 'hard-boiled.' The saints are never hard-boiled.

Christians are called to be child-like, and not to remain childish. The word St. Paul uses means infantile, immature, like babies who can only take milk. Christians are not like Peter Pan, the child who never grew up; he is a horror outside a fairy story. You meet real people like that in asylums, and they are horrible and pathetic. Christians are not meant to be cases of permanently retarded development; conversion is not reversion to childhood.

But there is a common belief to the contrary. 'Christianity,' they say, 'is kids' stuff; it's all right for the children, but we have grown out of that.' This is evidently the view of many parents who send their children to Sunday school, but never go to church themselves; and of the many who are confirmed, but never go on to become regular communicants. 'When I became a man I put away childish things' too often means 'I dropped all that when I grew up.'

The unborn child is in the centre of its universe. Its every desire is satisfied upon the instant. The infant continues for a while to retain the illusion of omnipotence. By slow degrees, more easily if other children are about, the child becomes adjusted to reality, and finds that there are other pebbles on the beach. He takes turns and waits for other people. He finds he is not omnipotent, but very weak. Surrounded by understanding love, he will gradually grow up without losing confidence, and achieve some sort of adjustment to facts as they are. Or, robbed at some point of what he feels to be his right, he may refuse to adjust, and stay emotionally retarded. He may go back disastrously, and try to live as if he were still in the womb; he may think of himself as

Napoleon or God, only cheated of his rights by a conspiring hostile world.

Religion itself may actually retard development. Some through all their lives continue to use God as a sort of emotional windscreen, or a thermogenic blanket to protect them from the chilling blasts of truth; the Church exists only to keep them cosy and to give them comfort. They are like axolotls, those curious fish which are really the larvae of salamanders, but they have managed to live and reproduce themselves without ever growing up at all.

Perhaps none of us is quite grown up. We still feel, and many times behave, as if we were the centre of the world, just as babies do. We react to whatever happens by how it affects *ourselves*. Even a great new fact like the resurgence of Asia is only judged by its effect on us. We cannot love, not really love, because we cannot love anything for itself, or anyone for himself. We can hardly rejoice at another's success for thinking that he has done better than we have. We magnify our grievances, and are tossed to and fro by every wind that blows up a storm in our own particular tea-cup.

We have no excuse whatever for infantility. Our Lord Himself is completely confident in God, and also completely without illusion. He accepts the facts of Nature, and their indifference to man. Storms and floods will overwhelm the house that is built on sand, whether its inhabitants are good or bad or not particularly either. He accepts the facts of human nature too, and of the world around Him—Jerusalem and Rome, publicans, Pharisees, and priests. He accepts the disciples whom God has given Him to work with; He makes do with what He has, and when they break, He mends them. He knows exactly what the cost of carrying through His mission will be, and He carries it through to the end.

His faith that God is His Father, and will give the victory, appears to be the last pathetic illusion; but it is the truth.

And so, the Christian who knows his business has no need to shut his eyes to anything. Christ has faced the worst, and conquered there. The Christian who knows his business has no occasion to feel as if the universe were centred in himself. He knows quite well that it all exists for God, and that he himself is nothing apart from God. He can face the night sky unafraid, and see himself as infinitely little, for in Christ he is called to be somebody.

The Christian who knows his business need not, like an ignorant and conceited child, think that he knows all the answers, nor like an enthusiastic and inexperienced schoolboy think that the last thing he has discovered is the final truth, or that the latest book he has read is the last word on the subject. He is no longer carried about by every wind of doctrine. He has behind him the whole corporate wisdom of Christ's people. Apostles and prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers—all witness to the same abiding truth; and, as he goes on, now here, now there, he finds out for himself that what they say is truth, and power, and victory.

We are too often content to remain infantile in our knowledge of religion, while we grow up in other things. If we are keen on music, we are not content to go on for ever singing 'Baa Baa Blacksheep.' We don't think history is all about Alfred and the cakes, or that a broken-down car can be got to run by wishful thinking. But we remain content for practical purposes with a knowledge of religion which has stayed at the Sunday school level or below — a few misremembered Bible stories, a picture of a benevolent Grand-dad in the sky, and, if we are lucky, the prayers we learnt when we were five.

Grow up here, too, I say. Learn to think and pray at the level of your knowledge of the world.

Bonhoeffer, that German theologian who was hanged by the Nazis, wrote from prison that the human race is being called to grow up, and to take charge of its own destiny, using the powers that science has given it. There is truth in this; we have to take responsibility. But we need not fear that we shall outgrow Christ. All the churches, all the Christians, all the world, are needed to give an adequate response to God's glory revealed in Christ. No one by himself can do it, nor all together can exhaust Him. And so St. Paul says we are to grow 'till we all attain to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto *a fullgrown man*'—not full-grown men. The full stature of the human race, what it really means to be a man, will only be seen when we all are redeemed out of our private worlds and joined in one by love. Then shall be revealed the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, and man will be grown up at last.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Straight Thinking about Unselfishness[1]

'Love is . . . never selfish.'—1 Co 13[4, 5] (Moffatt).

A year or two ago I went to see Emlyn Williams' play *The Light of Heart*. There is nothing very striking about the story, but it throws into a dramatic setting a problem that some of us have met only too often in real life.

A daughter sacrifices herself for her father. Then love comes into her life. There is a chance

[1] Leslie J. Tizard, *A More Excellent Way*, 91.

of a home of her own and of the children whom she wants more than anything else in the world. She rebels for the first time, pities herself, and claims the right to her own life. But at the crucial moment her father's need of her proves too strong. In the last moment of the play a pistol shot off stage conveniently solves her problem. So she is able to have the satisfaction of knowing that she did her duty to her father as long as he needed her, and now she can launch out with a good conscience into her own life.

Except on the stage, that sort of story does not generally end so happily.

Was this girl callously selfish when she revolted and claimed the right to live her own life? Or was she expressing a perfectly legitimate self-love?

The eighteenth-century philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, would tell us that it is a waste of time to discuss whether it is right or wrong to love ourselves, because we are so made that we cannot help doing it. We can never act from any other motive. If Hobbes had been at the play he would have said that there was no unselfishness in the daughter's devotion to her father and there could be none. It gave her a very satisfying sense of power and importance to feel that he was completely dependent on her. Selfishness may masquerade as altruism, but to say that no action can ever be done from an unselfish motive is surely a gross libel on human nature.

The trouble with so many people is that they do not distinguish between selfishness and self-love. They have never even realised that any distinction exists. The result is that anything which has any reference to self is branded as selfishness without further question. This undiscriminating 'unselfishness' is the ideal put before many children. They are constantly told 'You must not be selfish.' And that is very true if the meaning of selfishness is properly understood. But what it so often means on the lips of parents is: 'You must do exactly as I want you to do. And if you don't put me first all the time you will be a horrid, selfish child, and I shall not love you.' And, because to a child it is the most dreadful of all things not to be loved, he probably gives in and so becomes, as people think, a model child. He *always* puts others first. That is the way he hopes to make people love him. It becomes the pattern of his life.

But if love is never selfish, what passes for unselfishness is not always love! Does this wonderfully unselfish person really love? How can he, when all the time there is a deep, smouldering resentment?

Or here is that terrible person, the possessive mother. She slaves for her children. And in return she expects an absolute devotion. She has no doubt about her unselfishness, but does she really *love* her children?

There can be but one answer. Counterfeit unselfishness is not love. Indeed, these people are 'unselfish' precisely because they cannot love. Paul is right: love—true love—is never selfish.

The truth is, not that selfishness and self-love are identical, but that they are contradictory. Jesus made it clear that we ought to love ourselves. 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour *as thyself*.' This must mean that you cannot love your neighbour as he ought to be loved unless you know *how* to love yourself.

Love has been well defined as 'devotion to the ends of God in human personality.' Self-love, then, is devotion to the ends of God in my own personality. If love for myself is of that quality I shall not spoil myself, as foolish parents spoil a child, by indulging his every whim. I must sometimes impose a severe discipline upon myself. I must become—as Peer Gynt realized for himself at the end of his life of self-indulgence—'the man that I was when a thought of God's created me.' I must develop the powers God has entrusted to me. Of course, I cannot claim the fullest self-development regardless of any sacrifice that I might thus demand of others. When there are common tasks to be done, each must take his share, even though he would like to spend the time at his books or his music. But I must care enough for myself to develop my powers to the limit of my opportunity. There is nothing necessarily selfish about that. I may want to develop my gifts only to flatter my vanity. On the other hand, while finding a legitimate satisfaction in the unfolding of my powers, I may use them unselfishly. If I want to serve others as well as possible, which cannot be called a selfish ambition, I must serve them with my best self. As Dr. Fosdick observes, 'All valuable altruism roots back in a valuable kind of person who is being altruistic.'

Jesus says that if I do not truly love myself I cannot truly love my neighbour. Unless I am devoted to the ends of God in my own personality, I cannot be devoted to the ends of God in his. If I love myself aright, I shall desire for him what I desire for myself—not necessarily the same things, for they might be useless to him; but I shall desire for him whatever will help him to find his own self-fulfilment.

This leads us to the heart of the matter. True self-love can look outwards; selfishness never can.

The reality of love is not to be measured by intensity of feeling. The possessive mother often

has an overwhelming feeling of attachment to her child, and she mistakes this for love. But, it is not, because she wants to absorb him into herself.

If I love my neighbour as myself I shall not suppose that feeling is the end of the matter. Indeed, for any particular neighbour I may have no strong feeling of affection.. I cannot conjure up affection to order. But I can take any practical steps within my power to secure for him what I want, or ought to want, for myself—the opportunity for true self-fulfilment. Professor T. E. Jessop says: 'As a *concern* for others, not a simple feeling towards them, love has an objective end, the securing or maintenance or advancement of their welfare. It has therefore an equal concern with the means to this end, and concern with the means involves the desire and will to know the realm of hard fact which has to be managed if the end is to be attained. Love must discover at what points, and in what ways, it can most effectively insert itself in that realm.' Or, as Paul put it, 'Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.'

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Christian and Sunday[1]

'The sabbath was made for man.'—Mk 2^{27}.

Recently the vexed question of Sunday Observance has been before us again—and before Parliament too. It is imperative that we clear our minds about it.

In the New Testament the centre of controversy was not, of course, Sunday, but the Jewish Sabbath. The observance of the Fourth Commandment had been developed by the scribes to quite grotesque extremes. The attitude of the early Christian community to their special day, Sunday, was different. The emphasis was no longer on abstention from work and stern prohibitions, but on worship and thanksgiving. Yet its Jewish background was almost too strong for the young Church. Gradually the Christian Sunday gathered to itself more and more the associations and flavour of the Hebrew Sabbath; and that process continued right on into the last century—it is always more easy to accept the Old Testament than the New, to be 'Jews' than Christians. On the Victorian Sunday the emphasis was again on 'what we mustn't do.'

To-day this attitude is being challenged. The thinking Christian is placed in a real dilemma. He has no sympathy with those who would irresponsibly convert our Sunday into a weekly Bank Holiday. Yet neither is he happy about defending 'things as they were' behind a barricade of old and unstable laws.

In our perplexity we do well to look to Jesus. For Him, of course, the centre of controversy was the Sabbath, but it is a fair parallel. And on no point was Jesus more clear and courageous than here. 'The sabbath,' He stressed, 'was made for man, not man for the sabbath.' It is not a stern *demand* from God, it's His gift to us; not an irksome imposition but a lovely idea. In the Sabbath there is something *for us*; not so much to be 'observed' as to be *enjoyed*.

And what is this 'something' which God offers us on Sunday? It is an opportunity to be *re-created*. I have heard folk say: 'We must have *no recreation* on Sunday!' But that's exactly what we must have—in the literal meaning of that word.

God achieves in us this work of re-creation on three levels—if we will co-operate. He works first through our complete *change of occupation*. We miss the point if we think 'it's wicked to do any work on Sunday.' Rather must we see it's unwise (not 'wicked') to go on with our regular daily routine.

With this attitude we no longer ask plaintively: 'What mustn't I do on Sunday?' God gives no rules, just a guiding principle; and people will interpret that principle differently, according to their differing wisdom—and differing circumstances. A gardener may renew himself on Sunday with a little quiet theology; and the theologian with a little quiet gardening. The guiding principle should be a Godward look, and the question: 'Is this recreating me, for Him? Is it, in the best sense, good for me?' The crux is not so much *what* we are doing (on Sunday) but *why*; we must have a recognized purpose, and a good one. That is the test.

A second level on which Sunday may re-create is through our *human relationships*. We are wise if we use the opportunity Sunday brings for a more sustained and satisfying contact with our own family circle, and for a renewal of fellowship with our best friends. Nor must we forget the unique chance that Sunday gives to open our homes to the stranger; and in blessing, we shall find that we ourselves are blessed.

Thirdly—and most important of all—we have a priceless chance on Sunday to be re-created in our *fellowship with God Himself*. One great reason why a sense of unhurried quietness should mark our Sunday is because only thus can we truly feel — and enjoy — God's Presence. '*Be still*, and know. . . .' We shall not know Him if we are for ever bustling. So it is that the wise firmly carve out and keep, on their Sunday, times

[1] David N. Francis, *No Risk—No Fun!*, 51.

when they can read and think about God, and talk and listen to Him; times when they can seek communion with Him in church, and in company with others who love Him, can worship and adore. There is something bigger than 'duty' here. There is renewal.

But a second question confronts us. So far we have been considering *our personal use* of Sunday. It is equally important that over this issue we find and maintain a truly Christian *attitude to the community*.

Our first concern must be *to regain a right relationship* with the folk among whom we live. We must work to build between the churches and the community a bridgehead of understanding and respect, even if not of agreement. It would be a great tragedy (whatever the outcome of the Sunday controversy) if men were left thinking that we are only fighting selfishly, for our own interests; as puritans who would force them to be puritans too.

Secondly, we must adopt a more realistic attitude to the laws on Sunday Observance. At present they are chaotic. Such legislation brings the law—and the churches—into derision. We should be ready to have it overhauled.

But (thirdly) we must offer a powerful witness concerning the real importance of Sunday. While we have no right to cajole, to coerce or condemn, we *have* a right, and a duty, to put the Christian case as clearly and persuasively as we can. Even among those who cannot see the deeper significance of Sunday we have a strong case and a rational one. All men of reason can appreciate, for instance, the need to safeguard the rights of a *minority*: a measure of peace on Sunday for those who want to be quiet, and opportunity to worship for all who so desire. And equally reasonable is the plea that the 'quiet English Sunday' is a good thing in itself—sound medicine, sound economics, sound psychology, and sound sense. Even among non-Christians we have no need to be silent about Sunday.

If, however, we take 'the long view,' there are two further tasks to which Christians are ultimately challenged. One is: to *adapt* ourselves (without surrender) to social conditions in which we are in a minority. And the other: to work to *win over* our community.

Imagine yourself one of a large family, all living together. *You* happen to love listening-in to good music; but unfortunately the others prefer 'jazz' and 'swing.' Clearly, you can't insist that they listen to your choice of programme; nor can you ban their dance bands. So you set yourself a dual task. First, you determine to get in your own listening somehow, even if that means bringing a portable (tuned low!) into your bedroom; and you are right so to persist, for good music has become a vital food. But at the same time you will start, with infinite tact and patience, a determined crusade in musical appreciation, until the family enjoys that 'food' too. Here you are fastening on the real tragedy of the situation, which is *not* that they are making *your* listening-in difficult, but that *they are missing so much*!

Our long-term policy about the Sunday problem must be of the same dual order. On the one hand we must ensure that we keep all that is vital in our Sunday, with or without protective laws and a sympathetic environment. We shall remember that in some of the Church's finest hours it had neither of these. Yet it kept its Sunday.

On the other hand, we must be converting our environment; showing the world around us how very good a good Sunday can be. Men will ultimately be won, not by restrictive legislation but by something strangely attractive in our weekly programme. Our final victory will be in sight when men wistfully begin asking the secret of our strange weekly inspiration and renewal.

And then we can begin to explain why and how it is so. In explaining, we shall find ourselves inevitably talking, not just about 'the Lord's Day,' but *about the Lord*. Sooner or later we must get just there, for the Sunday problem holds for the Christian a challenge: not just to dig our toes in, but to evangelize; not just to defend Our Lord's Day, but *to commend Our Lord*.

Contributions and Comments

Scriptural Quotations in Q Material

Professor Bruce M. Metzger in the January number of The Expository Times [lxv. 125] comments on my Note: 'The Accounts of the Temptations of Jesus in Relation to the Q Hypothesis' (lxiv. [September, 1953], 382), in which I maintained: 'The fact that Matthew and Luke in this passage follow the LXX, even where this differs from the Hebrew, means that we must either deny that the Q material was originally written in Aramaic or refuse to assign the account of the temptations to Q.'

Professor Metzger replies: 'If an Aramaic account containing quotations from the Old Testament were reported in Greek by a writer familiar

with the LXX, who seldom (if ever) read the Scriptures in any other form, is it not likely that he would give the quotations for the most part according to the LXX?'

This is surprising. Why should a person who knew Aramaic sufficiently to translate it into Greek be one 'who seldom (if ever) read the Scriptures in any other form' than the LXX? And why, when translating from Aramaic into Greek, should he shrink from translating the Old Testament quotations directly and have recourse instead to the LXX? That procedure was certainly not adopted for the Old Testament quotations in the Q passages Lk 10^{15} 12^{53} 13^{27}, Mt 11^{23} 10^{35-36} 7^{23}; nor in Jn 13^{18} 19^{37}, where the citations follow not the LXX but the Hebrew.

Professor Metzger proceeds: 'Sometimes, it is true, he would depart from the LXX, because he did not correctly remember its phraseology, and sometimes because he was struck by the fact that the Aramaic account gave the passage a sense differing from that given by the LXX.'

A difference between the sense of the Aramaic and that of the LXX would presumably reflect a difference between the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the LXX, and this difference would be an excellent reason for departing from the LXX and remaining faithful to the Aramaic and the Hebrew. But this is precisely what has not occurred in the account of the Temptations. The LXX is followed even when it gives a sense differing from that of the Hebrew. Surely, therefore, the inference is justified that we are not here confronted by a translation from an Aramaic source.

A. W. Argyle

Regent's Park College, Oxford

A Note on John xviii. 6

This verse has frequently caused difficulty for commentators. For instance, Bernard says: the words 'imply no more than that the men who came to make the arrest (some of whom at least did not previously know Jesus even by sight) were so overcome by His moral ascendancy that they recoiled in fear' (*St. John*, ii. 587). He goes on to say that the phrase could be taken figuratively to mean that the men 'were floored.' This, however, ignores the proper force of *χαμαί*. Its only other use in the New Testament is at Jn 9^{6}, *ταῦτα ἐιπὼν ἔπτυσεν χαμαί*. Clearly here the word has the force of its classical usage, 'on the ground,' or 'to the ground' (cf. Herodotus, iv. 67, Plato, *Rep.*, 390c, and also Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of Greek Testament*, 683 for the *koine* use).

The suggestion that *ἐγώ ἐιμι* is equivalent to the mysterious אֲנִי־הוּא (*q.v.*, C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 93 ff. and 426), has more to be said for it, but there is no evidence that on other occasions the use of the title (if title it was) had such amazing results (*e.g.*, Jn 8^{28} *et al.*).

It would seem, therefore, that the way is open for some other approach to the interpretation of this verse. There is in Isaiah a verse which is very reminiscent of Jn 18^{6}, though the parallel is not exact. The LXX of Is 28^{13b} reads: *ἵνα πορέυσωσιν καὶ πέσωσιν εἰς τὰ* [1] *ὀπίσω, καὶ συντριβήσονται καὶ κινδυνεύσουσι καὶ ἁλώσονται* compared with, *ὡς οὖν εἰπεν αὐτοῖς ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀπῆλθαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἔπεσαν χαμαί* (Jn 18^{6}). Since *ἀπέρχεσθαι* and *πορεύεσθαι* are used without distinction in Isaiah for the translation of הָלַךְ (*e.g.*, Is 37^{37} where *απέρχεσθαι* is used) the reminiscence extends to more than the single phrase *εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω* which is fairly common in the LXX. At the same time it may be noted that in the LXX *εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω* is never used with *απέρχεσθαι* or *πορεύεσθαι* as in Jn 18^{6}, though the phrase does occur frequently with *στρέφω* and its compounds (Ps 40^{14} [39^{15}] 70^{2} [69^{3}] 56^{9} [55^{10}] *et al.*).

If this verse in John is a reminiscence of Isaiah it must be asked what lies behind its use. Is it possible that the idea of the 'tried' stone, which follows in Is 28^{16}, is seen also as the stone of stumbling of Is 8^{14}? Those who came to take Jesus 'stumbled and fell' over the stone they were setting at nought. That the Early Church saw a double meaning to the stone image is clearly shown by 1 P $2^{6ff.}$, and the same two passages (Is 8^{14} and Is 28^{16}) are combined in Ro 9^{33}. (The LXX differs from the M.T. at Is 28^{16}.)

The 1 Peter passage even has a rationale of this double aspect: 'For *you* therefore which believe is the preciousness: but for such as disbelieve, the stone . . . was made. . . . A stone of stumbling.' This goes back to Isaiah's 'He who believeth on him shall not be put to shame.' At the same time several Psalms make a parallel between being 'turned back,' and being 'put to shame': for example, Ps 40^{14b} (39^{15}) 'Let them be turned backward and brought to dishonour That delight in my hurt' (cf. Ps 70^{2}) (*ἀποστραφέιησαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἐντραπείησαν*) and Ps $6^{10(11)}$, 'All mine enemies shall be ashamed and sore vexed: They shall turn back, and be ashamed suddenly' (*αποστραφέιησαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ καταισχυνθείησαν*).

So it is the unbeliever that is put to shame, and it is precisely to the unbeliever that the chosen corner-stone is a stumbling stone. It is remarkable that St. John nowhere explicitly refers to the idea

[1] *εἰς τὰ*+ א AQΓ: — B.

of Christ as the Stone in either aspect unless we have here a cryptic reference to a well-known idea.

P. MEIN

Nottingham

θησαυρῷ κεκρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ (Mt xiii. 44) σκάψω περὶ (συνῆν) (Lk xiii. 8)

THERE are two echoes of New Testament language in the 1953 Reports of Refugee Work in Zerka, fifteen miles from 'Ammān. In her description of the work at Zerka Miss Winifred A. Coate of the C.M.S. (formerly Principal of the Jerusalem Girls' College) has the two following incidents to record, which take us back once more to the Palestine of Jesus and the Apostles :

(1) 'A peasant who had owned *a plot of land* in Palestine worked as a cook after coming to Zerka, but now both he and his wife are ill. His eldest son returned to Israel, slipping over the frontier to try to fetch *the money which the family had hidden in the ground* before leaving their home, but he was shot. . . .' (*Zerka Relief Industries* [1953].)

(2) 'One old peasant said recently, "Sometimes at night I dream that I am back in my village and am going out *to dig around* my olive trees" (σκάπτω is in Luke only).' (*Jerusalem Diocesan Housing Scheme Report, 1951–1953.*)

ERIC F. F. BISHOP

Glasgow

The Miracle at Cana

THE traditional view, accepted in all the English versions, is that the wine taken by the servants to the governor of the feast was taken out of the six waterpots. Some people even think that *all* the contents of the pots (120 to 150 gallons) were turned into wine—at that advanced stage of the feast!

Is another interpretation possible?—namely that our Lord's words, 'Draw out now . . .' after the filling of the waterpots, were a command to draw out from the well? The word ἀντλεω or its derivative ἄντλημα occurs three times in ch. 4 in connexion with the story of the Samaritan woman and appears to be almost a technical expression for drawing from a *well*. Would St. John have used the same word in ch. 2 for an entirely different action, that of baling or pouring from the waterpots? (In ch. 13 when Jesus 'poureth water into a basin' the word is βάλλει and in Rev 16 ἐξέχεεν, both translated 'pour.') Again, in the Cana story, it reads as though the six waterpots were in the house and in full view of the guests including the governor of the feast, but 'the servants which drew the water knew' where the water which had been turned into wine came from (and apparently they only)—as would be the case if it had been drawn from the well outside which we may presume was out of sight of the guests. ἄντλος is used in Homer of the hold of a ship, but we speak of a ship's 'well' and a sailing ship of any size would be baled from the 'well,' the same action as drawing up water from the well on land, with a rope and bucket.

In v. 9 οἱ ἠντληκότες looks like a definition of the work of these particular servants—'the servants knew'—that is, those whose work it was to draw the water.

Homiletically this interpretation is attractive—the tired servants obeying a new command, the apparently useless filling of the waterpots but so well done that all men could see it was indeed merely water they had brought in, the transformation of the well water at its source suggestive of dull routine duty transformed at the command of Jesus.

P. A. ILLINGWORTH

Natland, Kendal

Entre Nous

True Preaching

A book published in America is a dear book when it reaches this country; but it would be a thousand pities if the fact that it is a comparatively expensive book hinders all who have to preach from reading *Fire in Thy Mouth*, by Professor Donald G. Miller (Abingdon Press; $2.50). This is a most searching book on preaching. The theme is that the essence of Christianity is a unique redemptive act of God; that preaching itself must be a redemptive act; and that it cannot be a redemptive act unless it is based on the Bible, which is the unique record of that redemptive act. The book abounds in definitions of preaching. '"The gospel is an act of God," said Forsyth. "Its preaching must therefore be an act, a 'function' of the great act. A true sermon is a real deed."' 'To preach is to become part of a dynamic event wherein the living, redeeming God reproduces his act of redemption in a living encounter with men through the preacher. True preaching is an extension of the Incarnation into the contemporary moment, the transfigura-

tion of the Cross and the Resurrection from the ancient facts of a remote past into the living realities of the present.' Ruskin said that 'a sermon is thirty minutes to waken the dead.' 'True preaching is not achieved till the words of the preacher become the deed of God.' 'True preaching is a function of God whereby the agony of the divine redemption is brought to a focus through a man in the act of preaching.' 'The preacher stands before men as an interpreter of holy scripture, as a catalytic agent by which the redemption recorded in the Bible and the need for redemption in the human heart shall be brought together in a mighty fusion.'

Dr. Miller adduces six great reasons for Biblical preaching. (1) It gives the minister something to preach. When McCheyne was asked if he was afraid of running short of sermon material he answered, 'No, I am just an interpreter of Scripture in my sermons, and when the Bible runs dry, then I shall.' (2) It fosters breadth and balance in preaching. A rut 'is a grave with both ends knocked out.' A preaching of the whole of Biblical truth will preserve a man from preaching 'the same sermon on any text.' (3) It stresses abiding realities. 'The Bible is the cure for pulpit trifling.' As Dean Inge said, 'If you marry the spirit of your own generation you will be a widow in the next.' (4) It glorifies offensive themes. There are things which it might be offensive to preach about, but the offence is gone when they emerge from a Biblical passage. As Henry Ward Beecher said, 'The squire can hardly stamp out of the church for a "Thus saith the Lord."' (5) It acquaints people with the Scriptures. 'Most people who to-day do not carry a Bible under their arm to church do not carry it in their heads either.' (6) It imparts authority. 'The preacher does not create truth; he bears witness to truth.'

In regard to the preacher himself the Bible has three great uses. (1) It cultivates his own soul. 'The Bible is the preacher for preachers (P. T. Forsyth).' We do not read about Judas to analyse his motives or to get a twenty-minute sermon but that 'through his story I may see the treachery of my own heart to God.' (2) The Bible is the source of the minister's theology. Behind the creeds there is a religious experience and only study of the Bible can reawaken it. (3) The Bible is the great weapon of the pastoral ministry. Some facet from Scripture is worth any amount of mere talking. Once Alexander Whyte in leaving a woman who was suffering from an incurable disease quoted Is 40^{31} as the Scottish paraphrase has it, 'On eagles' wings they mount, they soar.' 'Put that under your tongue,' he said, 'and suck it like a sweetie.'

No note can do justice to the riches of this book. After a man has read it he will enter his pulpit with a new vision of his task.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Billy Graham

The Billy Graham Story, by Dr. Charles T. Cook (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 8s. 6d. net), is a highly topical book. We are very grateful for such straightforward information about an evangelist who is so unquestionably making such a spiritual impact on the life of this country. Let it be said at once that Billy Graham is no uneducated evangelist. He began his training at Bob Jones College, Cleveland; he continued it at Trinity College, Tampa; he is a B.Sc. in anthropology of Wheaton College, Illinois; and he was president of the North Western Schools in Minneapolis; and he is a minister of the Southern Baptist Convention. It is well that the public should know these facts.

According to Billy Graham the roots of revival are (1) The Prayers of God's People; (2) The Power of the Holy Spirit; (3) The Power of the Word of God. He quotes with approval the saying of Jonathan Edwards, 'Our people do not so much need to have their heads stored as their hearts touched.' As any evangelist must, he preaches for decision. 'Confession is repentance of our sins, and turning in yieldedness to Him.' There is not the slightest breath of opposition to the churches. 'Evangelism . . . to do any permanent good must be integrated into the Church.' The book contains five of Billy Graham's own sermons; and they are sermons which are in every way excellent and compelling preaching. This book gives us a heart-moving and heart-warming picture of a man who is a real and dedicated servant of God. But in this book there is also the implication of something which we fear will be a real problem in the days to come. It is Billy Graham's aim to build his converts into the Church. That is excellent: *but*, if that is so and if that aim is achieved, there will enter the Church very shortly a large number of people whose outlook is basically fundamentalist and whose theology is almost crudely conservative. The very success of Billy Graham is going to bring a very difficult problem for the churches to solve; and it will be a tragedy if it is not solved, because if it is not solved there will be war in many congregations instead of peace. This is not a condemnation of Billy Graham; it is a challenge to the churches.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

POSTAL TUITION
FOR THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

& M.Th. DEGREES: DIPLOMA in THEOLOGY

At the London University B.D.
(External) Examination 1953

29

WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS PASSED
and formed
HALF THE PASS LIST

Prospectus Free
from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D.,
Director of Studies, Dept. GE 4,

Wolsey Hall
Oxford

BOOKS FOR PREACHERS AND TEACHERS

Recent additions:

The Rise of the Prophets
By NORMAN J. BULL, M.A.

Just published, an admirable and graphic summary of the life and message of the great Hebrew Prophets. Ample study notes and valuable teaching notes and lesson outlines for this most important and topical section of every Syllabus.
With maps and time-charts and a good index.
Linson boards, **7s. 6d.** net (postage 3d.)

Jesus and His Teaching
By NORMAN J. BULL, M.A.

Sixteen full chapters that cover the life of our Lord and expound His teaching as exemplified in His life.
'Many hundreds of teachers have already had good cause to be grateful to the Religious Education Press for their *Teachers' Guides to Religious Education.* Those teachers will expect from the fifth volume in the Senior series further detailed and scholarly help, and they will not be disappointed.'—*Teachers' World.*
Linson boards, **7s. 6d.** net (postage 4d.)

The King and His Service
By E. H. HAYES and F. S. POPHAM

'If a teacher knows this excellent series, then he will be waiting for the next volume. Here it is and worthy of its predecessors in Guides to Agreed Syllabuses. There are blocks of lessons from Old Testament and New Testament, the former including Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, too often neglected in the primary school.'—*Scottish Educational Journal.*
Linson boards, **7s.** net (postage 4d.)

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS LTD.
Wallington *Surrey*

New Books

An Approach to Christian Doctrine
Edited by GREVILLE P. LEWIS, B.A., B.D. **10s. 6d.** *net*

Leading scholars, preachers and ministers have co-operated to produce this volume, which provides a useful and important exposition of the Christian Faith. It has been adopted for the training of the Local (Lay) Preachers of the Methodist Church, and this means that the book has been written with the student in mind—but with a difference; the students are men who will be expected to make plain to others, in everyday language, the things which they themselves have read and learned.

The Craft of the Sermon
By W. E. SANGSTER, M.A., Ph.D. **9s. 6d.** *net*

This volume combines two of Dr. Sangster's books on preaching, *The Craft of Sermon Construction* and *The Craft of Sermon Illustration.* They have earned golden opinions from every branch of the Church, and this combined volume is likely to establish itself as the standard work.

In the Things of My Father
By WILFRID L. HANNAM, B.D. **9s. 6d.** *net*

The many who knew and appreciated the great gifts of the late Wilfrid Hannam will be glad to have this new edition of his studies in the Gospel of St. Luke. To a new generation the clarity of his exposition will be a source of continuous delight. (*May* 27)

In Pastures Green
By F. W. BOREHAM
Illustrated. **2s. 6d.** *net*

Few preachers dare to preach about the twenty-third Psalm until they have reached the years of discretion and wisdom to which Dr. Boreham has long since attained. In this little book, beautifully illustrated and printed in photogravure, the veteran preacher and writer confidently expounds this greatest of all the Psalms and shows how goodness and mercy do surround the lives of those who find God.

THE EPWORTH PRESS
25-35 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1

The Library of Christian Classics

Already published

ADVOCATES OF REFORM edited by Matthew Spinka
AUGUSTINE: EARLIER WRITINGS edited by J. H. S. Burleigh
CALVIN: THEOLOGICAL TREATISES edited by J. K. S. Reid
CHRISTOLOGY OF THE LATER FATHERS edited by E. R. Hardy
EARLY CHRISTIAN FATHERS edited by Cyril C. Richardson
ZWINGLI AND BULLINGER edited by G. W. Bromiley

30s net each

Prospectus for the whole series available

Studies in Biblical Theology

Already published

BAPTISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT by Oscar Cullmann (Fourth impression) 6s net
THE BODY by J. A. T. Robinson (Second impression) 7s net
EARLY CHRISTIAN WORSHIP by Oscar Cullmann 8s net
GOD WHO ACTS by G. Ernest Wright 8s net
THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT by A. J. B. Higgins 7s net
MAN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT by Walther Eichrodt (Second impression) 6s net
MYTH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT by Ian Henderson 7s net
THE NEW TESTAMENT AGAINST ITS ENVIRONMENT by Floyd V. Filson. (Third impression) 6s net
THE OLD TESTAMENT AGAINST ITS ENVIRONMENT by G. Ernest Wright (Fourth impression) 6s net
ORAL TRADITION by Eduard Nielsen 7s net
STUDIES IN DEUTERONOMY by Gerhard von Rad 7s net

Prospectus available

SCM PRESS

56 Bloomsbury Street London WC1

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.* *Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 19s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£10, 10s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*